

THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW

VOL. VI

JULY, 1905

NO. 1

Revolutionary Russia.

"Only the shallow minded see subtle catastrophies and inexplicable happenings in nature as in history," says Barbe Gendre. We hear of an uprising and think it is sudden. The cry for freedom, for rights of man reaches our ear, from a distant land, and we think that the people of that land have suddenly awakened from a deep slumber. But these are erroneous ideas. Nothing in nature or in history is sudden, though it may seem so. Every change, every resolution is the result of slow steady growth.

When we first heard of the great strikes in dark despotic Russia we were somewhat puzzled. Had the goddess of discontent and revolt turned her eyes toward the land of the knout? Had Liberty showed her enticing beauty to the poor oppressed people of an unfortunate land?

We might well ask ourselves these questions. For we pay very little attention to Russia's inner life, when things go on in their "normal" course. But whether we know it or not, these strikes of today, those for liberty as well as those for bread, are the natural result of years of hard work on the part of liberty loving men and women.

To go back to the history of the revolutionary movement, we might begin with the year 1825, when the first attempt to overthrow tyranny was made. This attempt was made on December 26 (14 old style) of that year, by those who were afterwards called the "Decembrists," a group composed mostly of members of the aristocracy who during their stay in Paris became imbued with the spirit of liberty. This attempt was crushed by the crude Nicholas I.

Before going further let me say that Russia was not always a despotic monarchy. It had communal autonomy, and local liberties. About the 13th and 14th centuries Russia had developed industrial centers that could be likened to little republics. But

they all perished in the flames caused by Ivan III and Ivan IV (XVI century) and with the death of these centers freedom passed.

Liberty can never die, it may endure a lethargic sleep, but die never. Tyrants may think that it can be killed, but time and history have proved the reverse. When the "Decembrist" movement was destroyed, the crowned despot congratulated himself, he believed that the friends of freedom were dead forever. Before long however, we see Alex. Herzen appear on the stage. Herzen was a man of learning and great literary talent. His noble ideas expressed in a beautiful literary style won a place for him in the hearts of the younger generation, and for the cause of freedom they won noble soldiers. "Kolokol" (the Bell), a paper he published, was eagerly read by all intelligent classes. As for its influence we need only listen to the sublime apostle Peter Krapotkin, who says, "The beauty of the style of Herzen—of whom Turgenieff has truly said that he wrote in tears and in blood as no other Russian,—the breadth of his ideas and his deep love for Russia took possession of me, and I used to read and reread those pages even with more full of heart than brain" (Autobiography of a Revolutionist). Scores of young men and women would unhesitatingly say the same thing of Herzen. Such was his influence, and this influence bore fruit.

High ideals and noble inspirations took possession of the youth. An irresistible desire to lift the people "to pay the peasant his debt" overtook them. When Alexander II who was advised by his teacher, the loving poet Jukovsky, to remain a man on the throne, began to reign over Russia, every heart was directed toward him in the hope that he might prove a helper in this cause.

When, in 1861 the proclamation of liberation of the serfs was published, it seemed this hope would be realized. Twenty thousand serfs were made free! how much help, moral and material, was needed! The youths set to work, they opened night schools to instruct the peasant whose children they taught during the day. The press being practically free, it gave birth to great writers. To that period we owe Tchernishevsky Dobruliuboff and Lavroff. The latter's "Historical Letters," published in the "Sovovremnic" (Contemporary) were the basis of the future Nihilist movement.

However Alexander II was not a man of strength. He was soon persuaded by conservative despots, that his policy would undermine him; that the growing spirit would end in revolution and in the destruction of the empire. The monarch forgot his teacher's advice, he shut down the schools at once, imprisoned the teachers, persecuted the writers and censored the press. This reaction of the emperor created a contra reaction. An underground movement came into existence. Those who had tried to help the czar in his attempt to reform became its leaders.

The workers of this movement were the best and noblest men and women Russia had. Besides writers, poets and philosophers, we find men who have had public offices; Osinsky was secretary of a City Hall; Voinaralsky a justice of the peace; Sucharoff a young marine officer of noble birth. These and scores of others resigned their positions and went to work for freedom's cause.

Freedom and speech of the press being forbidden, other means of protest against tyranny were looked for. Nechaieff tried to organize a secret society for the preparation of a popular uprising. The attempt failed; some victims fell.

Meanwhile armies of young men and women went to Zurich to study. There amidst freedom's lovers these young students became enamoured of liberty. Alexander II, who had changed his policy in the meantime, fearing that these men and women might become dangerous if they continued to remain in Switzerland, published an "Ukaz" (1873) ordering all the students to return immediately. A refusal to obey this command meant everlasting banishment.

Hundreds of students all imbued with the words of Bakunin and with the ideas of Marx and Lavroff hastened home. We now enter the period when the cry "among the people" came from every noble heart.

These young men who on their return to Russia found a country where the word liberty became a dangerous word, threw off their broadcloth and put on the coarse garb of the peasant and the laborer. The pen was exchanged for the hoe, the library and laboratory, for the shop and factory. Side by side with the worker and peasant they could talk to him of the ideas of freedom and justice; they could help him and console him.

Spies were sent broadcast by the government and they dragged men to prison for the crime of reading a Socialist book or newspaper. Thus the breach between the government and the lovers of the people became more and more pronounced.

It must be remembered that the Russian woman has done her share of work well. The names of women like Sophia Perovskaya, Sophia Bardine, Sophia von Herzfeld, Jessie Helfman, Figner and numbers of others can never be forgotten. All these women, most of whom belonged to the highest aristocracy, left luxurious homes to live in huts with the peasant. Sophia Bardine, who was reared in luxury, worked fifteen hours a day as a weaver and slept on straw, only to be with her sister workers in order to present to them the dawn of a better day to come. Sophia von Herzfeld was sent to Siberia after she was made to witness her dear husband's death on the gallows. Before such heroes and heroines even their foes might raise the hat in awe.

Those enumerated here are only a few of the many victims

of Russian despotism. Persecutions, prisons, torture, Siberia and gallows could not kill the revolutionary movement. The propaganda went on actively, and in the year 1877 we see a new era setting in. This era is marked by the two greatest political trials in Russia—the trial of the fifty and that of the one hundred ninety three.

The trial of the fifty was especially remarkable for the great number of women who were among the delinquents. These women, part of them students who had just returned from abroad, were as courageous as their male comrades. Sophia Bardine for instance, delivered a long address in court. She gave a resume of the ideas that she and her comrades propagated, and finished with the following words:

"The group of which I am a member, is a group of peaceful propagandists. To help the people see the ideal of a better social order, an order based on justice, or rather to awaken the dim ideal that slumbers in the brain of the people, to point out the faults of the present state of society and by this avoid falling into the same errors in the future, this is our ideal. When the good hour of this beautiful time will strike, we know not, it does not depend on us.

"Whatever may be my fate, I do not ask any mercy from you. Strike us as hard as you please. I am convinced that all your drastic measures to hinder our work will not be able to kill a movement that is caused by the spirit of the time. To be sure, you can hinder its growth for a moment, but it will grow stronger. The day will come I am certain, when society will awaken from its lethargic sleep, and it will blush with shame because it had allowed its brothers, sisters, children, in fine that it had allowed the sacrifice of these people whose only crime was that they spoke out frankly their convictions. All our suffering will then be avenged. Strike ye judges; you have the brute force, we have the moral rights, the law of historic progress, the irresistible power of the ideal, but know ye, that this power cannot be conquered by bayonets."

We can imagine what an impression these words, coming from a young woman, made on the jury and the public. After her came Alexeeff, a man of the people, he spoke about the ills of the present system and concluded with these words: "Yes, only these generous youths have given us their helping hand. They will guide us till the day will come when we shall be able to understand our rights we shall then be able ourselves to work for the emancipation of the world, till the day comes when the strong arm of millions of workers will be lifted...."

The judge (angry) "Enough I command."

Alexeeff (raising his voice) "and in spite of all your bayonets, that protect despotism, they will put an end to it."

These addresses, the frankness with which they were spoken, the sincerity of the speakers, gained great sympathy for them and their cause. The sentences were comparatively light.

Soon after this, the great trial of the one hundred ninety three took place. In this were involved Kibalchitch, Perovskaya, Mychkin, Helfman, Rissakoff Jeliaboff. These too, availed themselves of the opportunity to bring their ideas before the public. For this the court room was as good as any other place. Some protested against the exclusion of the representatives of the press from the court room, and against the closing of the door to the general public. Mychkin said: "This is no trial, it is a ridiculous farce. Tools of a despot, cringing cowards, to obtain a high rank, a decoration, trifle with other people's lives, jesting at truth and justice, at all that is sacred on earth."

This was too much for the tools of czarism. The cossacks at once fell to beating the speaker and other defendants. But this time too the sentences were not very heavy, on the whole. Not long after these trials the public was aroused by a pistol shot, which may be said to announce the era of terrorism. A young girl, Vera Sasulitch by name, asked for an audience with General Trepoff and as soon as she found herself face to face with Russia's Torquemada, she shot at him. The public was perplexed, every one gave another interpretation to her act. But great was the astonishment when the real cause was learned. This pistol shot was a protest against the recent torture of Boguliupoff—an imprisoned student whom she had never seen. So great was the public sympathy for this self-sacrificing maiden, that she was acquitted.

The act of Vera Sasulitch should have served as a warning. But despotism was too stupid to understand it. Not only did its brutality not cease, but it became fiercer. Revolutionists were tortured and killed. This of course was answered by similiar deeds against the government officials.

The men and women who began to propagate peacefully the ideal of liberty and justice, saw that naught but violence was left. In violence some of them saw the only way toward salvation. Others still desired to continue the propaganda peacefully, a breach became inevitable and two parties were formed, "Zemlia i Volia" (Land and Freedom) and "Narodnia Volia" (the Will of the People). The will of the People party was that of the terrorists, with Mikailoff and Tokomiroff as organizers, and Lavroff as editor of their organ called "The Messenger of the Will of the People." Mikailoff knew every corner of St. Petersburg; he was the most daring character in the movement and no one was as much on the alert as he. He was a member of the executive committee that sentenced Alexander II to death on August 26,

1879, after first giving him due warning, to alter his conduct. We know that after a few unsuccessful attempts this sentence was carried out on March 1, 1881.

The revolutionary movement had to pay dearly for the life of the monarch. Sophia Perovskaya, Geliaboff, Kviatcovsky, Kibaltchich and Hesse Helfman were among those who were to suffer imprisonment and death. Although the movement suffered by this enormous loss, the remaining force did not lose courage. On the accession of the new czar, Alexander III, the executive committee sent him the following note:

"If the supreme power ceases to be arbitrary: if it honestly resolves to be the organ of the nation's will, your majesty may then without fear dismiss the spies that dishonor the government, send back the soldiers to the barracks and burn the gallows. The Executive Committee will of itself renounce its role, and the forces grouped around it will scatter to work for the welfare of the people and the furtherance of civilization. A peaceful propaganda will take the place of the violent strife—a strife that displeases us more than it displeases your servants, but to which the conditions only impell us. We hope that the desire for revenge will not overpower in you, Sire, the voice of duty, the desire to listen to truth. Desire of revenge! Have we not also the right to feel it? You have lost a father, we have lost not only parents, we have lost brothers, wives, children, our dearest friends. But despite all this, if Russia's salvation demands it, we are ready to lay aside every personal passion. That much we expect from your Highness."

The reader has learned by this time, I hope, the character of the Russian revolutionary movement and that of its promoters.

What difference is there between the movement of which we have spoken and the movement of today? The difference is great and significant. But few years ago only students and members of the aristocratic families were engaged in the fight for freedom. Few workers or men of the people could be found in the ranks of the revolutionists. Today thousands of them have joined the movement. The revolutionary movement is no longer a movement of the "higher classes." It is a movement of workers, class conscious workers, well organized, ready to carry on a propaganda work that in some respects is more complete than the propaganda work for advanced ideas in free America. Books and pamphlets are scattered broadcast, newspapers and magazines are handed to the workers. Besides the literature printed in Russia, some is imported from England, America and Switzerland. The latter being the center of activity, whence funds and literature go to Russia. As a means of active propaganda the strike is employed. The strike is the best teacher of solidarity. Violence is not as

wide spread as formerly, violence is only resorted to in extreme cases. Of course the work is carried on with some difficulty, especially as the numbers are swelling. Discretion must be used, spies must be kept out.

The meetings are generally in private houses, sometimes important meetings are held on the water. One or more circles of workers, people whose good faith is above doubt, rent row boats, on Sunday, and set out for a pleasure ride. When they are far enough on the river, away from inquisitive eyes the boats get nearer each other and a regular conference begins. Ways and means, as to how to carry on the propaganda work is discussed. Reports of committees are rendered, news from abroad are read and the meeting closes with songs of liberty coming from hopeful maidens and valiant youths. Where such meetings are impracticable the deep forest is resorted to.

As to how much the outside people sympathize with the movement may be illustrated by the following story, told me by a friend of mine, who was prominent in the movement: "A lot of young fellows all students, were assembled in my room, I lived in the house of a very pious Jew, we were discussing the situation of our fatherland and of the people. When we disbanded it was two o'clock in the morning. When I conducted my friends to the door, I was surprised to find my host awake. This being very unusual at such an advanced hour, I asked him, 'Why have you not gone to bed Reb Moishe?' He smiled, nodded his head and answered in a whisper, 'You think I do not know what you young men are discussing. I know it very well. May the Lord crown your efforts with victory. I am awake to watch over you my children, as you lay your young lives at stake for us.'"

O. LEONARD.

Leclaire College, Edwardsville, Ill.

Marx and His Critics.

(Continued.)

THE first objection to be considered here is the so-called "philosophic" objection. We will consider it first because of its great pretensions and because of its old age, it being in reality merely a new edition of the old idealistic philosophy with which Marx had to deal as far back as 1845. In its pure idealistic form Marx squared his accounts with it in his own masterly fashion in his book "*Die Heilige Familie*." The account was settled, the balance was struck, and no more was heard of idealism. It now re-appears bashfully under cover of a scientific theory of cognition and psychology. No matter what its garb, however, it is essentially the same, except that with the loss of its purity it has lost its logic. Pure idealism, as represented by Hegel for instance, is logically a perfectly constructed edifice. It rests on false foundations. But its premises admitted, its logical construction is impregnable. Not so with modern "philosophy." It is idealistic without the logic of the finished idealistic structure. What is worse, however, it is reactionary, which is not necessarily an attribute of idealism. Desiring to avoid the logical consequences of the development of philosophy, in which the idealistic system of Hegel must inevitably be followed by the Materialism of Marx, its watchword is: "Go back." And the further back the better.... So that we find Weisengruen, a leading light among those philosophers, throwing loving glances at Berkeley, who was perhaps as much of an idealist as Hegel himself but who was utterly devoid of the historic sense which made Hegel a truly great philosopher and his system a great step forward in the development of philosophy.

Indeed their aversion towards anything that has some historic sense leads Weisengruen, otherwise a sane and bright thinker, to declare that the real force that makes History is the imagination or phantasy (*Phantasie*). To use his own words: "Phantasy is the demi-urge of all History.... Not the developed intellect, but the elementary phantasy." A discovery which is worthy to rank with that of the charlatan Nossig, who, after posing as a great scientific Marx-critic, gravely announced, with all the pomp of pseudo-science, that he discovered a remedy to all our social evils in the old Jewish custom of the Jubilee.

We cannot, however, go here into the details of the philosophic objection and its numerous variants. Such discussions are only intended by their authors for German professors and such

others as enjoy the perusal of bulky volumes. Under no circumstances are they meant for magazine readers. I will simply say, therefore, that the sum and substance of all these arguments amounts to this: That there is no way in which material conditions can be shown, philosophically, to turn into ideas; consequently, that ideas cannot be the result of economic conditions; and that, therefore, the existence of ideas and their influence on History not being denied, economic conditions cannot be the prime movers of History.

The answer to all of which is, again without going into long and abstruse philosophic discussions, that, as Engels puts it, the proof of the pudding is in the eating. That if we can prove by historic *data* that the development of ideas *did* follow the development of economic conditions then we need not worry over the "philosophic" question of how the transformation was accomplished. That it will then be the business of "philosophy" to take care of itself and show how it was done or frankly confess its impotency. It is clearly a case of those philosophers' own funeral.

It is true that the learned philosophers, in the person of Professor Masaryk strongly object to the introduction of such vulgar "matters" as puddings into the discussion of such lofty subjects. But the loftiness is all theirs, and we who do not soar in the realms of phantasy can very well afford to stick to the gross "material" facts. We, therefore, claim, with Engels, that the proof of the materialistic conception of history must be furnished by history itself.

But when it comes to actual history, they must admit that the facts, or at least a good many of them, happen to tally with the unphilosophic Materialistic conception of History. So says Weisengruen himself:

"For certain historical relations within certain periods of time this historical theory (The Materialistic Conception of History) is a relatively correct, practical, explanatory principle (*Erläuterungsprinzip*). We can, for instance, by its aid drag out from historical obscurity the more hidden economic forces which propelled the French Revolution. We can, by its aid, I am convinced throw more clear and glaring light on the period of decline of the Roman Empire, than could be done until now. Many phases of the German (?) middle ages may be understood by us with the aid of a mild economic motivation. The powerlessness of the German Bourgeoisie, particularly during the year 1848, may be partly explained by purely economic causes."

As the reader will see, this great opponent of Marxism, who in another place of his book insists that Marxism must be thrown overboard, bag and baggage, is willing to concede quite considerable to the Materialistic Conception of History. In fact, he has

nonchalantly conceded almost all of European History since the beginning of the Christian Era (The breaking up of the Roman Empire, the German Middle ages, the French Revolution, the German Revolution), with the exception of the Renaissance which he specifically exempts from the influences of material conditions and reserves it, supposedly, for "higher" influences. He then draws the general conclusion that some relations ("*zusammenhänge*") and periods may be treated according to the Materialistic Conception of History, and others may not. Curious as it may seem for a philosopher to arrive at such half-way conclusion about a purely philosophic matter, it is even more curious to observe that this same philosopher and critic, instead of following up his conclusion by an examination of the provinces and periods when the Materialistic Conception of History does apply and when it does not, at least in general terms, turns around and declares that as far as we can see, there are no historical laws at all, and that it is practically impossible to write or treat history scientifically, in short, that there is no historical science. This Nihilism, which as we have said, is the last recourse of the opponents of Marxism, if they want to keep at least the show of being scientific, is very significant, as we meet with it not only in the province of philosophy of history but all along the line of sociology, including political economy, as we shall see later.

But it is not only the Nihilists among the Marx-critics who do not follow up their criticism with the only decisive proof, that mentioned by Engels, the proof of history. Instead, they indulge in generalities, such, for instance, as:—Marx gives "undue" "prominence" to the material factors and disregards factors which ought to be considered. Expressions that mean absolutely nothing, because of their indefiniteness, and are absolutely incapable of verification, by any method, except perhaps, the "subjective" one of everybody deciding for himself, according to his fancy, which factor got its "due," and which did not.

The slowness on the part of Marx-critics to talk more definitely is not due to any constitutional defects. These gentlemen are usually quite voluble. It is simply a case of discretion. Whenever they do say something definite it can easily be shown that either the historic facts do not bear out the critics or that Marx never said the things attributed to him. It seems that most of the critics of Marxism suffer with a singular malady which may be termed: "Confusion of Terms and Ideas," which makes them attribute to Marx and his disciples all sorts of things which neither Marx nor his disciples said or could have said, as appears plainly from their writings, with which their critics are very familiar. So do for instance, Professor Barth, Weisengruen and others, make, what they evidently regard as a very strong point against the Materialistic Conception of History by showing that

the changes in the technical development of the means of production can not, alone, explain all the facts of History. In this they are undoubtedly right. But,—and there is the rub,—the Marxists never claimed any such thing. The assumption that the Marxists do claim such a thing evidently rests on the confusion by the critics of the terms “economic conditions,” usually employed by the Marxists with the term “technical development.” A confusion which does not do much credit to the faculty of discrimination possessed by these gentlemen, and which seems most surprising in such acute and astute thinkers.

It seems peculiar that such a simple matter should require long explanations. But all Marx-critics seem to be so much affected by the disease referred to, that it is pretty dangerous business to take it for granted that they are able without outside aid to see the most obvious distinctions and differences. Be it therefore said here for the Nth time, that while changes in the technical development of the means of production usually go together with changes in the material conditions of the people, they do not necessarily so go together and are separate and distinct from each other. That while the technical developments in the means of production and distribution are the chief cause of changes in the material conditions of the people, they are not always so and not necessarily so. That there are other causes which may affect the material conditions of the people, and that there are changes in the technical part of production and distribution which do not at all affect the material conditions of the people. And that the Marxists claim that it is the changes in the “material conditions” that are the prime movers of history, no matter what the causes of these changes may be. The technical development only affects the course of history indirectly and only in so far as it causes changes in the material conditions under which people live and work.

From the same malady,—Confusion of Terms and Ideas,—springs another great objection to the Materialistic Conception of History. It is advanced with great vehemence by most critics of an “ethical” bent of mind. Among others, by the well-known English socialist, E. Belfort Bax. It is to the following effect: People do not always act out of self-interest. They are very often swayed by ideal motives and then act quite contrary to their own interests. Hence, the fatal error of the Materialistic Conception of History in making the “material interests” the prime movers of History.

This objection has been partly answered already in a previous article, where it was pointed out that the Materialistic Conception of History has nothing to do with the question of individual idealism. That it was not a theory explaining the motives which actuate individuals to act, but a historical theory explaining the

motive powers which bring about those actions of the masses, the aggregate of which make up what we call history, the powers which are the "causes of the causes" of individual action. A man may very well act against his own interest, even sacrifice himself, for the sake of an ideal, and yet his action may be the result of the material interests of a class or group which produced that ideal. For example: The ruling class of Japan needs new markets for its expanding industries. Russia is in its way because the ruling classes of Russia for some reason or other need the same markets. Japan and Russia go to war for the control of these markets. This begets a high patriotic fever in both countries, and thousands and tens of thousands of people sacrifice their lives willingly for the high ideal of "My country forever." Among those thousands there are very few who are directly "interested" in the issue of the war, and even these would probably never give away their lives for those "interests" if it were put up to them as a mere business proposition. Most of those who will sacrifice their lives in this war for the "honor" of their country will be people who have no "interest" in the war, who may be even affected injuriously by the war, but who sacrifice their lives for the high ideal born and begotten from the interests of their class, or of the ruling class under whose moral and intellectual tutelage their class stands. While the actions of the individual participants in the war is, therefore, the result of ideal motives, the historic event itself, the war, is the result of material interests, which are in their turn the result of economic conditions.

Aside from the confusion, however, between the motives of individuals and the motive powers of History, this objection also rests on the further confusion of "conditions" with "interests." The Marxists never said that material "interests" control the course of History. They always use the expression, "material conditions," and material conditions are something entirely different from material interests. Material conditions usually beget material "interests," which shape the course of History, but not always and not necessarily so. Sometimes material conditions will bring about historical phenomena which are not the result of any "interest" in the usual sense of that word, but merely of the condition itself. Karl Kautsky in a discussion with Belfort Bax used this example: The turning away from all earthly interests, the longing for death, of early Christianity may,—he says—very well be explained by the material *conditions* of the Roman Empire at that time. But it would, of course, be monstrous to attribute the longing for death to some material *interest*.

If the learned critics would only carefully refrain from substituting other terms and ideas in place of those used by Marx and his disciples a good deal of their criticism would have abso-

lutely no room, and the rest could easily be answered. So, for instance, would a careful reading of Marx and a clear comprehension of the terms used by him do away with all the objections which admit that the economic factor plays an important role in history but think that "too much" is claimed for it, and that other factors are "not taken into account."

So do most of the critics talk of Marx's failure to "take into account" such things as human nature, race, geography, etc. Those of our readers who have read carefully these articles will have seen that these things have all been "taken into account," and when the Marxists still insist upon the economic factor as the determining factor of historical progress it is because this factor is the only one which accounts for the *movement* of history, the *progress* of the human race from one state to another, as all the other factors are comparatively stationary, and could therefore account perhaps for a *condition* of the human race but not for its *Progression*.

That it was not any failure to "take" these things "into account" that led Marx to proclaim the economic factor as *the* material factor which *moves* history, a mere cursory reading of Marx will show. In his work on Capital, he says:

"Aside from the more or less developed condition of social production, the productivity of labor depends on natural conditions. They are all reducible to the nature of man himself, such as race, etc., and his natural surroundings. The outward natural conditions can be divided, economically, into two great classes; natural wealth in the means of subsistence, such as richness of soil, fish-abounding waters, etc.; and natural wealth in means of production, such as usable water-falls, navigable rivers, woods, metals, coal, etc. In a primitive community the first class of natural wealth is of paramount importance, on a higher plane of civilization it is the second-class that is the most important."

To insist after this on the "technical development" being the only historical factor recognized by Marxists would seem absurd. But Marx critics are a peculiar race. There is nothing that they cannot do, or at least say. From what was said in the preceding articles it would seem clear that Marx and his disciples not only recognize the influence of ideas, but accentuate it, and that in their scheme of the transition of the capitalist system into socialism, ideas play a distinct and quite important role. And yet most of the critics still tell the old yarn of Marxists not admitting the influence of ideas. Furthermore, they are not a bit abashed when they are shown by quotations from Marx that he thought just the other way. When they are caught "with the goods on," they very coolly declare that Marx is contradicting himself. That is, the Marx of "Capital" and other well-known works, is contradicting the Marx which they put up for their readers' delecta-

tion. Indeed, lately this business of "refuting Marx by Marx" has developed into a special industry, which would contribute a good deal to the gayety of nations if they were only in the mood for it. As it is, the "nations" which read these things are worried too much by the subject-matter to be amused. It will, however, be amusing to our readers, and we shall attend to these "contradictions" in due time. We must, however, defer this treat until the time when we will come to consider the Marxian system in its entirety, as a reward to our readers for their patience. Besides, it will then be better appreciated. Here, we will mention only one as an example:

The Russian critic Ludwig Slonimski finds this contradiction: Marx,—he says—put up the theory that economic and class interests are the only motives of the political and legislative activity of the State, and yet, he himself, tells us of the praiseworthy activities of some factory inspectors, particularly Leonard Horner, who, he says, deserved well of the working class for protecting their interests!

Is it not really surprising that Marx is still thought of a good deal in some quarters, and that people generally refuse to accept the decision of M. Slonimski who announces that: "No matter how much the admirers and followers of Marx, who believe in the scientific character of his method may protest, the truth is that he merely created a Utopia which is vulgar in its nature and is only suited to the narrow horizon of ordinary workingmen and to the notions of the imagination of those who see in the amount of pay they receive for their labor the highest blessing?"

We will also leave for future consideration the question of the "modification" of the Marxian theories at the hands of their authors, of which there is so much talk in the literature of Revisionism. These supposed "modifications" are really nothing more than an attempt to make the supposed contradictions plausible, and deserve to take their place right alongside of them. We will, therefore, limit ourselves at this place to objections springing from mere confusion of terms and ideas. We want to say again, however, that the malady is so general with Marx-critics, and its ravages so extensive that it is absolutely impossible even to recount them properly, not to say analyze them all, and we will perforce be compelled to attend only to some shining examples. There are some individual writers who at least by volume, if by nothing else, have won for themselves a place of honor in the roster of Marx-critics, and we will have to return to them again when occasion offers. So, for instance, Professor Masaryk, to whom we intend to devote a separate article later on. Here we only wish to add to the confusionists already mentioned, our own Professor E. R. A. Seligman of Columbia University, Presi-

dent of The American Academy of Political and Social Science, etc., etc., who has written what our book-reviewers call "a very readable" little book entitled "The Economic Interpretation of History." It must be admitted that Professor Seligman, being an American, believes in fair play, and that he is "eminently fair" and even generous to Marx. With this, however, and perhaps, because of it, he is exceedingly superficial, and scandalously confused. I shall return to the gentleman at some future time after the conclusion of the present series of articles, when I shall discuss the question of "monism" in history, of which he treats. I do not consider it properly within the bounds of the present discussion, for the reason that the question of "monism" is not one which affects the Materialistic Conception of History alone. It affects the idealistic conception of history just as well. In other words, it is a question that affects philosophy in general. As such it also affects the materialistic conception of history, but it is not an objection exclusively directed against Marxism,—our present topic of discussion. Of course, all these questions are inter-dependent, particularly with the confused mode of treatment pursued by most Marx-critics, who usually serve up in their writings a Hungarian Gulosh or an American hash of objections of all sorts and kinds thrown together. Here, therefore, is, for the present, a mere taste of our American Marx-critic. We will serve the preparation in its original wrapper, and let the readers dissect or analyze for themselves. He says:

"All human progress is at bottom mental progress; all changes must go through the human mind. There is thus an undoubted psychological basis for all human evolution. The question, however, still remains: what determines the thought of humanity? * * * This claim (that all sociology must be based exclusively on economics, and that all social life is nothing but a reflex of economic life) can not be countenanced for the obvious reason that economics deal with only one kind of social relations and that there are as many kinds of social relations as there are classes of social wants. We have not only economic wants, but also moral, religious, jural, political and many other kinds of collective wants; we have not only collective wants, but individual wants, like physical, technical, aesthetic, scientific, philosophical wants. The term 'utility,' which has been appropriated by the economist, is not by any means peculiar to him. Objects may have not only an economic utility, but a physical, aesthetic, scientific, technical, moral, religious, jural, political or philosophical utility. The value which is the expression of this utility and which forms the subject-matter of economics is only one subdivision of a far greater class. For all the world is continually rating objects and ideas according to their aesthetic, scientific, technical, moral, religious, jural, political or philosophical value without giving any thought to their economic value. So far as utility and value are social in character, that is, so far as they depend upon the relation of man to man, they form the subject-matter of sociology. Economics deals with only one kind of social utilities or values, and can therefore not explain all kinds of social utilities or values. The strands of human life are manifold and complex.

"In this aspect what is untrue of the individual can not be true of the group of individuals. We have passed beyond the time when it was

incumbent to explain the fallacy lurking in the phrase 'the economic man.' There is indeed an economic life and an economic motive—the motive which leads every human being to satisfy his wants with the least outlay of effort. But it is no longer necessary to show that the individual is impelled by other motives than the economic one, and that the economic motive itself is not everywhere equally strong, or equally free from the admixture of other influences. A full analysis of all the motives that influence men, even in their economic life, would test the powers of the social psychologist. There is no 'economic man,' just as there is no 'theological man.' The merchant has family ties just as the clergyman has an appetite. * * *

"In one sense, accordingly, there are as many methods of interpreting history as there are classes of human activities or wants. There is not only an economic interpretation of history, but an ethical, an aesthetic, a political, a jural, a linguistic, a religious and a scientific interpretation of history. Every scholar can thus legitimately regard past events from his own peculiar standpoint."

Has anybody ever been across a greater mix-up of truths, half-truths, untruths, platitudes and meaninglessness? Whatever may be said as to whether or not "the strands of human life are manifold and complex," one thing is quite certain: Human life is too short for one man to attempt to unravel all this nonsense.

If all changes (Changes of what? Of environment or of environment into institutions or ideas?) must go *through* the human mind but do not originate there, why is all human progress *at bottom* mental progress? Isn't the thing which changes, and its changes which go *through* the human mind, at the *bottom* of human progress, and the mental progress, the result of these changes going *through* the human mind, only the *top* of human progress? Is not Marx right when he insists that the changes which go *through* the human mind are the *basis* of all social progress?

What does he mean by "social wants" and "collective wants," and are these terms interchangeable? And why does he slide down from social or collective wants to individual wants? Does he mean to say that the Materialistic Conception of History is incorrect because it does not explain or "take into account" individual wants? What does he mean by "technical" want as an individual want? Does he mean to say that Physical and Technical "wants" (whatever these may mean) are not material wants? Are not technical relations exclusively social and economic relations? Doesn't the learned professor know that some Marx-critics, among them his distinguished colleague, Professor Barth, object to the Materialistic Conception of History because the technical development alone does not explain history? And who is right? Professor Barth, according to whom the "technical development" is all there is of Marx's explanation; or Professor Seligman, who objects to Marx's explanation because it does not include the "technical wants?" Will the gentleman kindly vouchsafe an explanation of "scientific" want, "philosophic" want, and "jural" want? What does he mean by "Jural" relations? Does

he mean the social relations as expressed in codes of positive law? If so, does not he know that these laws deal almost exclusively with the property relations of people, which are certainly material and economical relations; and that the few exceptions "deal" in "morality;" that whatever "jural" relations there may be are to all intents and purposes economic relations, even according to his own view of them, and that *all* jural relations are necessarily contained in the economic and moral relations, indeed, are their expressions?

What does Professor Seligman mean by suddenly, without warning or explanation, substituting "economics" for economic interpretation of history, and in talking of "economic," "economists," "utility," "value," as if the materialistic conception of history were an explanation of history by means of the special science known as political economy? Does he mean to say that there is any warrant in Marx even for a suggestion of this kind, or does he simply speculate on the ignorance of his readers who probably know nothing about Marx, except that he was a writer on political economy? And is that why he first changed the Materialistic Conception of History into an "Economic Interpretation of History?" Is it all intentional confusion, or is he really so confused? And why does he tell the Marxists "that it is no longer necessary to show that the individual is impelled by other motives than the economic one," have not they themselves reiterated this for the benefit of their critics *ad nauseam*. And hasn't Marx himself put the "economic man" to rest in his grave, from which the opponents of Marx are now trying to raise him? As an economist he ought to know these things. But if the demise of the "economic man," and the attempts at his resuscitation have not been noted in Professor Seligman's statistical department, why didn't he inform himself of it from his friend, Professor John B. Clark?

What does he mean by a "linguistic" explanation of history, and is that based on a "linguistic" relation which is the result of a "linguistic" want? What does he mean by a "religious" explanation of history, besides an "ethical" one, (whatever *that* may mean)? Does he mean a creed or church explanation? And does he really mean that a "scholar" can "thus legitimately" "regard past events" from such a "standpoint?" And does he really think that notwithstanding all this, there is still room for a "scientific" interpretation of history?

There are some other very interesting questions we might ask Professor Seligman, but the strands of human life being so manifold and complex, as Professor Seligman truly observes, and the Marx-critics being so many and so multifarious, we must leave him in peace, particularly as he probably meant no harm. But before leaving him we must ask him what has become

of his quest for the cause which "determines the thought of humanity," with which he started out? Has he forgotten all about it? And yet, that was *the* question under consideration!

That was *the* question to be considered, if he was really anxious to find a scientific explanation of history, or, rather, if he wanted to treat history scientifically. But that is just what modern Marx-critics are extremely anxious to avoid. Hence, their plea for all sorts of "standpoints," "factors," etc., etc., which they themselves do not define or explain, but which serve the general purpose of making the scientific treatment of history impossible. In this even such extremes as Seligman and Weisengruen agree. Except that while the superficial and democratic American is "easy" with the historians, and announces that any tommyrot, written from any "standpoint," is as good science as anything else: the thorough and conservative German makes the task of the historian impossible of accomplishment by claiming that scientific history must contain things which it is impossible for it to contain, and which, if it were possible to put them in there, would make it absurd.

Weisengruen objects to the theory of the class-struggle. But not because there is no such struggle. Oh, no! That there is a struggle of the classes into which society is at present divided he can no more deny than Seligman can deny that the economic relations of society are the principal motive-power of History. But just as Seligman finds other "relations" which enable him to write history from all sorts of "standpoints," so does Weisengruen find all sorts of struggles which he claims must be "taken into account" by a scientific historian. These struggles, which, according to Weisengruen, go to make up real history, are not merely social struggles but also struggles between individuals, and are of every nature and description. His demands upon scientific history are, therefore, so many that they cannot all be recounted here. Here are some of them, as a sample:

The "scientific" historian must embrace, with an "intuitive" gaze, the real essence of the period of which he desires to treat, and must at the same time be able to correctly measure its "psychical range." He must know every occurrence, even the smallest: and must be acquainted with every document, even of the least importance. And in order that the reader may not think lightly of this task, Weisengruen takes care to warn him of the insuperable difficulties which will beset the scientific historian. And those difficulties are indeed insuperable. For it must be remembered that Weisengruen does not refer to social occurrences, or public documents. No, he means *every individual occurrence* of any kind or description, and *every private document* of whatever import. Quarrels between husband and wife, neighborly gossip, love-letters, everything is here included. *And*

everything about everything. For our author has suddenly grown very democratic, and insists that everybody makes history. Nothing is so mean, nor is any station in life so lowly, as not to influence the course of history. In order that there be no mistake about it, he gives the following express instructions: "*He (the historian) must know all the persons (of the period he describes), their family relations, their actual course of action, as well as the opinions they held of each other.. All to the smallest detail.*"

Then he must know everything about everything else in creation: All sorts of relations between all sorts of groups in society, covering all the social relations of the people, the economic structure of society, the politics, ideas, sciences, etc., etc., and everything to the minutest detail. The Marxists also demand knowledge of all these social matters but Weisengruen does not mean it that way at all. No. He is a thoroughgoing scientist, as we have already seen, and therefore the historian's knowledge of social matters which he demands must be on a par with his knowledge of individuals and their relations as already hinted at. For instance, the historian must not only be acquainted with the tools, manner and processes of production in use, and the things produced during the period of which he treats, but he must have an actual inventory of all the "goods, wares and merchandise," as well as of all the household furniture, clothing and other worldly goods, possessed by each and every person who lived during that period, with all of whom, as we already know, the historian must be personally acquainted.

If this is not materialism run mad, what is it?

Of course, Weisengruen knows the absurdity of all this. And this would never have been said if it were not for the terrible plight in which he found himself in attempting to disprove the claim of the Materialistic Conception of History to the sole and exclusive possession of the attribute *science*, in its own proper field. Weisengruen's madness has method. All this moonshine is put up to us in all seriousness for one purpose only. If all this is impossible, and there is no denying that fact, then scientific treatment of history is impossible until some dim and distant future of which we can take no cognizance. And meanwhile, (and there is the rub), there is no science, and anybody and everybody has license to write any rot he pleases from any "standpoint" he pleases....

You see, we are at the same old game again....

Weisengruen and Seligman, Masaryk and Slonimski, and the rest of the tribe, are essentially alike. Whether by way of ponderous philosophic moonshine, or elegant phrase-mongering, the flow of objections to the Materialistic Conception of History runs from the same source, and it wends its course towards the same objective point.

L. B. BOUDIN.

(To be Continued.)

Wisconsin and Her Critics.

A great deal of criticism is being offered of late upon the Wisconsin Socialists. It is claimed in some quarters that the state platform is not up to standard and that the recent action in the matter of the judicial election is a violation of socialist ethics. This also is made an occasion for raising other questions in regard to the state, and altogether it seems quite in place to inquire into the peculiar nature of the Wisconsin movement.

This is not the first time that Wisconsin has been criticised. The writer remembers very distinctly what a storm of protest arose when the Socialists of Wisconsin adopted a municipal program. Immediately individual socialists and rigid "revolutionary" locals rushed into print with loud and insistent resolutions, denouncing the municipal platform as "utopian," "middle-class," "unscientific," etc. The national organization at its convention appointed a committee that drafted a report on "suggested lines of socialist municipal activity." But it was put forth with reservations and with a sort of half apology and a distinct disavowal of any intention to make it even a suggestion, and "least of all does it partake of the character of a proposed platform." Sometime before this the Milwaukee comrades had adopted a municipal platform with the usual "immediate demands." They were compelled to do this in spite of the fact that they knew it would be assailed by the impractical and the doctrinaire. The criticism came in a storm and from the usual sources. But everyone who had a knowledge of the socialist movement in other countries knew that Milwaukee was right and it is now acknowledged so. And now St. Louis, Chicago, Minneapolis and indeed the Socialist Party of almost any city can quite safely copy the Milwaukee municipal platform or write a similar one.

At another time there was a terrible storm of criticism about the working program or so-called "immediate demands" in the Wisconsin platform. This criticism was, of course, a part of the general fight for a program all through the country and Wisconsin had many allies. But the criticism was fierce and menacing enough. And it continues even yet in some quarters. We are only a few months away from the Omaha manifesto.

All this criticism was made as usual in the name of scientific, class-conscious, revolutionary, clear-cut socialism. And this in

spite of the fact that Marx and Engels themselves wrote a long list of "immediate demands" into the communistic manifesto itself. (See page 45 Kerr edition, or 33 Debs edition).

These critics of Wisconsin socialism tore their hair and grew red in the face denouncing the platform that had the working program, because they said it was not in accord with international socialism. In one case, in a western city that has since grown famous for its ridiculous criticism of our present national platform, a very "revolutionary" comrade shook a copy of Liebknecht's pamphlet on "Socialism, What it is and What it seeks to Accomplish" into the writer's face, and exclaimed, "This is international socialism! This shows your middle class 'immediate demands' to be nothing but treason to the working class." I drew a duplicate copy from my own pocket and read from it the platform of the Social Democratic Party of Germany. It contains forty-two "immediate demands." Readers will find translation of this, which is the Erfurter Program, on pages 27 and 28 of the pamphlet above referred to.

The critics of the "immediate demands," who are in every case the same individuals who have all along so fiercely assailed Wisconsin, when confronted with the fact that Marx, Engels, Liebknecht and the Social-Democratic Party of Germany, were with Wisconsin and against their impossibilism, began muttering something about the German Socialist movement not being quite up to snuff. It took a little nerve for these American pigmies to pronounce against Marx, Engels, Liebknecht and the German movement of fifty years of experience and scientific research. But an impossibilist is capable of anything. "Fools rush in where angels dare not tread." So they took a change of venue and went over to France, Belgium and other nations and here they declared we had the pure quill.

But this serves them no better. The platform of the French Socialist Party adopted at Tours in March, 1902, is even longer than the German program and contains even more of the immediate demands. The Belgian program is still "worse"—to speak from the standpoint of the impossibilist. It is two years later than the Erfurter program having been adopted in 1893, and is perhaps the most perfect in form and constructive in nature of any socialist platform in the world. One who has listened to the jargon of the American impossibilists and hasn't taken time to look these matters up, will be surprised when he reads the Belgian platform. The Austrian Social-Democratic Party at its conference at Brunn in 1891 is just as "bad" as any of the rest. In England the Social Democratic Federation adopted a revised platform in 1903; the Independent Labor Party adopted theirs in 1903-4; and the Fabian Society revised their so-called "Basis" in 1900, but however much these parties and platforms may differ

they all have a long list of immediate demands. Comrades who care to make a comparative study of the platforms of the various international socialist bodies will find them translated in a recent volume by R. C. K. Ensor,—“Modern Socialism, As Set Forth by Socialists in Their Speeches, Writings and Programs,” published by Harper and Bro.

So it comes to this, that there isn't a group of socialists anywhere in the world that has a platform without a program of immediate demands, except that little coterie of fanatics that worship at the shrine of the discredited De Leon, and the impossibilists. And yet Wisconsin has been bitterly assailed for doing what every section of the real socialist movement of the world has found absolutely necessary and right.

Still more recently Wisconsin has been criticised fiercely for a provision in its state platform to have congress nationalize certain great monopolies and pay the actual value for the same. This, of course, is a dreadful insult to the doctrinaire impossibilist who dismisses the whole program of socialism and the whole question of transition, the whole struggle for economic emancipation with two words—“revolution and confiscation.” And yet Karl Kautsky, Emil Vandervelde, Wilhelm Liebknecht and even Karl Marx himself, talk of compensation. Why should Wisconsin be assailed for a position taken by men of this kind, and besides, this is only a question of the program for this year. If we could get these monopolies by buying them this year, we would gladly do so. Next year it may be necessary to change our program.

Engels wrote in 1894,—“We do not consider the indemnification of the proprietors as an impossibility whatever may be the circumstances. How many times has not Karl Marx expressed to me the opinion that if we could buy up the whole crowd it would really be the cheapest way of relieving ourselves of them.”

Vandervelde says,—“There is no doubt that the expropriation without indemnity with the resistance, the troubles, the bloody disturbances which it would not fail to produce would be in the end the most costly.” (Collectivism, page 155.)

In discussing this question of compensation, Karl Kautsky says in his Social Revolution, page 118,—“There are a number of reasons which indicate that a proletarian regime will seek the road of compensation and payment of the capitalists and land-owners.” In another place, page 113, “A portion of the factories, mines, etc., could be sold directly to the laborers who are working them, and could be henceforth operated cooperatively; another portion could be sold to cooperatives of distribution, and still another to the communities or to the states. It is clear, however, that capital would find its most extensive and generous purchaser in the states or municipalities and for this very reason the majority of the industries would pass into the possession of

the states and municipalities. That the Social Democrats when they came into control would strive consciously for this solution is well recognized,"—except in America.

So here again it comes to this that the position taken by the Wisconsin comrades is quite in accord with the best and ripest thought of the Socialist movement of the world.

Again, it was the Wisconsin comrades who first developed a farmers program. And this too has been the subject of fierce criticism. In one case a whole state committee went to the extreme length of refusing charters to locals upon no other ground than the applicants were farmers. And as usual this too was done in the name of scientific international socialism. And there is at this time in certain quarters even yet an inclination to look with suspicion upon the effort to enlist and organize the agricultural working class into the Socialist movement. And yet upon this matter too, it is the Wisconsin movement that is first to square itself with the best thought of the best socialists in the world. No less a writer than Liebknecht is found saying in his pamphlet on "What is Socialism" above referred to;—"And mark well, under working people we do not understand merely the hand workers, but every one who does not live on the labor of another. Besides the city and country laborers, must be included also the small farmers and traders who groan under the burden of capital even as the laborers proper. Yes; in many cases yet more." (Page 5.) He saw, what Wisconsin sees, that the economic interests of a great majority of the farmers lie with the wage earners in socialism.

In view of the fact that 40 per cent of the voters of America are on the farm, while only 25 per cent of the voters are furnished by the workers in commerce, mining and similar industries (Simons, "American Farmer" page 161 and 155, also Mills's "Struggle for Existence" chapter XXXII and paragraph 605); and, farther, in view of the fact that 90 per cent of all those engaged in agriculture are exploited to as great an extent as the wage workers in other countries (Mills, paragraphs 441 to 443); and in view of the fact that as Simons says,—“It is certain that within any period that can be calculated upon as effected by the present social and economic movements, we will have to deal with agriculture in America as conducted by a class of owners of small farms” (American Farmer, page 114); in view of these facts the proposition to refuse farmers admission to the socialist movement is only in degree less absurd than to criticise a body of socialists for undertaking to adapt their appeal to them. Sooner or later we must secure the cooperation of these agricultural voters and the effort to adapt our propaganda to this phase of our problem should receive the assistance and not the rebuke of our comrades.

But here as everywhere, the constructive socialists must encounter the carping criticism, the tirade and the ridicule of the doctrinaire and the shallow minded. All sorts of derogatory epithets are hurled at us. We are "populists!" Bernsteins!" "opportunists!" "single-taxers," "green-backers," etc., etc. And all this because we set ourselves diligently to the task of understanding the conditions and needs of the farmer, and of adapting ourselves and our propaganda to them. But this effort, like all the others referred to above, is strictly in accord with the best thought of the best men in the international socialist movement. The Belgian Socialist Party has a long and carefully elaborated farmers program. This includes such things as 'insurance against epizootic diseases, diseases of plants, hail, floods and other agricultural risks, organization of cooperation securities to assist in buying machinery, seed, manure, etc., etc. The same is true of the platform of the French Socialist Party. In Germany there has been a decided advance in this direction. At the Congress at Frankfort in 1894, a strong committee was appointed to study the Agrarian question and lay proposals before the next congress. This committee had on it men of such recognized standing in the international socialist movement as Bebel, Liebknecht, David, Von Vollmar and a long draft of proposals was submitted. They were finally rejected. But another committee was appointed; and the fact that these measures were proposed, and by men of such recognized leadership, shows that even the German movement is a long way in advance of the doctrinaire position of those who criticise a farmers program.

And now finally Wisconsin is criticised for not putting a ticket in the field at the last judicial election, and comrade Victor L. Berger, is arraigned for editorially advising socialists to vote against a certain capitalist candidate after it was decided by the party not to go into the election. In this criticism the same voices have been raised, the same haste and ill temper shown and the same lack of appreciation of the principles which have lead the socialists of other countries to do identically the same thing. All sorts of drastic things have been proposed, from removal from the National executive committee to expulsion from the party. And that in spite of the fact that the action has been no violation either of the state or national platforms or constitution nor of the principles of the international movement. In reply to all the talk about disloyalty to international socialism it is sufficient to say that in hundreds of cases in Germany, France, Belgium and indeed in every country where the socialist movement has really developed the comrades have done over and over again exactly what Milwaukee and Victor L. Berger did this spring.

In all these different criticisms which have been raised against Wisconsin, there seem to be several peculiar elements, all of them

evidences of weakness. In the first place, there are the elements of ignorance on the part of those who are too careless or lazy or indifferent to take time to read the works of the authoritative writers of the international movement.

As a rule, the loudest criticisms come from this source. And in that case it is simply the effrontery of stupidity. Then again, there seem to be those of our comrades who are convinced of the correctness of the positions held by the Wisconsin comrades and their friends, but seem to lack the courage of their convictions and so allow themselves to be drawn into the usual stream of adverse criticism. In that case it is sheer intellectual cowardice. And finally, there are those who are new in the movement and have not had an opportunity for sufficient study of the principles of the party here and elsewhere to ground them well, and, in their sincere anxiety to be right they act with the parties that make the biggest noise. This is only the weakness of youth.

None of these elements of weakness need be serious. Inevitably as the comrades study more and as knowledge of the principles and tactics of the international movement increase these elements of weakness will disappear. But, meanwhile, it is the duty of every socialist comrade to inform himself upon these matters, to read the great writers of the socialist movement and help to put the Socialist Party of America past the doctrinaire stage of petty controversy.

CARL D. THOMPSON.

Evolution of the Theory of Evolution.

(Continued.)

These first half-conscious movements of proletarian thought were as immature as capitalism itself was. But they were at least unmistakably proletarian, and this fact makes the utopias of these three men superior to the dreams of Plato and More. Historically, these French and English utopians excelled also their followers, such as Bellamy and Groenlund, in keenness of perception and political influence. All the attempts at independent proletarian movements in the beginning of the 19th century connected themselves with the ideas of these prophets of social revolution. Philosophically, these men were the heirs of Locke and of his French school. Whoever is looking for the roots of the modern socialist philosophy, must seek them here. No one knew this as well as the founders of scientific socialism. Some of the modern socialists are of the opinion that the socialist philosophy took its departure from the German classical philosophy. But Marx and Engels knew better, and Engels entitled his book on Feuerbach advisedly "Feuerbach and the Outcome of German Classical Philosophy," and declared that the modern proletariat was the "heir" of this philosophy. The English translator of this work, by transforming this title into the "Roots of the Socialist Philosophy," committed a violation of a historical truth, which both Marx and Engels had fully acknowledged. Scientific Socialism rejected the classical philosophy of Germany, took its departure from the humanism of Feuerbach, and connected itself with the materialist philosophy of the 18th century.

This acknowledgment was made by Marx and Engels, in "The Holy Family," in these words: "Just as Cartesian materialism leads to French natural science, so the other school of French materialism leads directly to socialism and communism. It requires no great keenness of perception to realize that the doctrines of materialism relative to the original goodness and equal intellectual endowment of men, to the omnipotence of experience, habit, education, and the influence of external circumstances on men, the great importance of industry, the justification of enjoyment, etc., lead necessarily to a connection with communism and socialism. If man gets all his knowledge and feeling, etc., from the world of sense perceptions and his contact with it, then the thing to do is to arrange matters in the material world in such

a way, that he gets truly human impressions from it, acquires them as habits, and realizes his human nature. If the correct understanding of material interests is the basic principle of all morality, then the private interests of man must be made to coincide with general human interests. If the human race is unfree in the sense that the materialists use this term, that is to say if he is free, not so much by his negative power to avoid this or that, but rather by his positive power to assert his true individuality, then it is not proper to punish the crimes of the individual, but to destroy the antisocial breeding grounds of crime and to secure for every one the social room for his essential life expressions. If man is formed by external circumstances, then circumstances must be modeled to suit man. If man is by nature social, then he can develop his true nature only in society, and the power of his nature must not be judged by individuals, but by that of his societies. These and similar statements are found almost literally in the works of even the oldest French materialists.... Fourier takes his departure immediately from the teachings of the French materialists. The Babouvists were crude and uncivilized materialists, but even the developed communism starts directly from French materialism. The latter emigrated, in the form given to it by Helvetius, to its mother country, England. Bentham founded his system of well understood interests on the ethics of Helvetius, and Owen, starting from the system of Bentham, founded English communism. Exiled to England, the Frenchman Cabet was stimulated by the communist ideas of his exile and on his return to France became the most popular, although the most superficial, representative of communism. The scientific French communists, Dezamy, Gay, etc., developed, like Owen, the teachings of materialism into those of realistic humanism and into the logical basis of communism."

The close of the 18th century was marked by two discoveries which left their imprint on science for a full hundred years. First, the introduction of vaccination as a preventive against smallpox, by Jenner, in 1796, stirred up the old bones in medicine, and in the second place, the invention of the Voltaic pile by Volta, in 1799 revived the interest in electricity. Jenner's idea showed, that the futility of the prevailing symptomatic treatment of diseases was being realized, but his method was itself still a fight against symptoms, instead of a removal of causes. It must be admitted, that it was the best that could be done under the prevailing historical conditions, for capitalism limits all human activity to more or less symptomatic methods. One hundred years of practical experience with vaccination and similar preventive methods have demonstrated, that the scientific way to treat diseases is to remove their causes, and this understanding found

its logical application in the revolutionary method of the class-conscious proletariat.

Volta's invention was the forerunner of great discoveries in experimental physics, all of which were so many little stones in the beautiful mosaic of a monistic conception of the universe. Ever since Franklin had made his experiments with lightning, scientists had studied the atmospheric phenomena and investigated the nature of electricity. Rumford, in 1798, and Davy, in 1799, published the results of their experiments on the nature of heat. Thomas Young established the undulatory theory of ether by explaining the interference of light. And Dalton, who had elaborated his atomic theory in chemistry in 1803 and communicated it to Thomas Thompson in 1804, published his "New System of Chemical Philosophy" in 1808.

The fundamental laws, which dominated the physics and chemistry of the 19th century, were thus established. It was not until the beginning of the 20th century, that doubts as to the soundness of these three theories were expressed and the desire for their reconsideration became strong enough to lead to a greater accuracy in terms and definitions. Dalton made a new departure in chemical methods, and gave rise to two schools. One of them devoted itself to chemistry, the other to physics. The first result of Dalton's methods in chemistry was the practical determination of atomic weights by Berzelius, begun in 1811. And in physics, Gay Lussac and Avogadro modified the Daltonian theory profoundly. Gay Lussac showed in 1808, that combination between gases always takes place in simple relations by volume, and that all gaseous densities are proportional either to the combined weights of the various substances, or to rational multiples of their weights. And Avogadro generalized the new ideas in 1811 and announced his law that "equal volumes of gas, under like conditions, of temperature and pressure, contain an equal number of molecules. At the same time, the principle of classification, adopted by natural science, worked its way into economics, politics, and law. These specialists were little aware of the fact, that they were contributing their share to a monistic conception of all phenomena in the universe, and undermining inch by inch the foundation on which the theological belief in supernatural miracles rested.

Capitalism was now in its ascending stage, and its technical requirements in transportation and markets soon led to an improvement of steam engines and means of general communication. Fitch made an unsuccessful attempt to introduce steam navigation on the Delaware, in 1790. The first steamboat on the Clyde and Forth was launched by Symington, in 1802. And finally Fulton steamed up the Hudson, in 1807, and succeeded where Fitch had

failed. The first locomotive was placed into practical commission in 1804, and the discovery that smooth wheels were better for railroads than toothed wheels was made in 1813. Then came the first successful trip of a train drawn by a locomotive, made by Stephenson in 1829. Improvements in railroading were accompanied by the invention of the telegraph and telephone, the credit for which is due to Wheatstone, Oersted, Henry, Morse, Edison and Bell. Steam navigation across the Atlantic ocean was inaugurated in 1838, and the first trans-Atlantic cable between Europe and North America was completed in 1866. The postal and telegraph systems came rapidly into use, with cheap postage and mailing facilities. Capitalism penetrated into the remotest hamlets, created a world after its own image wherever it went, and at the same time abolished the element of distance in human intercourse.

From now on, scientific exploration trips to every quarter of the globe became a permanent feature of human life, and a network of scientific stations was spread over the surface of the earth from pole to pole. The tropics and the frigid zones, the highest mountain ranges and the hidden valleys, the depths of the seas and the interior of the earth, were compelled to give up their secrets. Every unknown territory was invaded, and a steady stream of facts began to flow into the studies of the scientists. Soon hundreds of thousands of minds and hands were busy accumulating, sifting, classifying evidence, and theorizing on it. One startling discovery after another followed in bewildering succession. It would require volumes to appreciate the merits of even the most remarkable accomplishments of science, in the 19th century, for the formulation of a monistic conception of the world.

Specialization became an inevitable result of this activity. Among many new departments in science, the 19th century gave birth to that specialty, which has done more than any other to bring the nature of the human faculty of understanding into reach of empirical methods and take away the last mystical ground on which the theory of a supernatural soul rested. That specialty is biology. This term was first employed by Threviranus, who selected for his life's work the creation of a new science, which should study the forms and phenomena of *life*, its origin, and the conditions and laws of its existence. In his "Biology, or Philosophy of Living Nature," published in 1802, he defined life as the "uniformity of reactions on unlike stimuli of the outer world." He thereby established a principle in natural science, which has been all too frequently overlooked by scientists and philosophers, namely the interrelation of the individual and its environment. But a few remembered it and used it with the most revolutionary effect. The living animal and plant now became the objects of

study as well as the dead, and the most intimate processes of nature were stripped one by one of their mysterious character.

It is interesting to note, though quite natural from our point of view that, the ideas of the ancient natural philosophers reappeared simultaneously with the new accomplishment of science. Irrespective of confessional differences, scientists of various nations returned to materialists and monist methods. And evolutionary ideas unavoidably accompanied this tendency, for as we have seen, the ancient natural philosophers were all more or less imbued with evolutionary (dialectic) ideas.

When Goethe published his "Metamorphosis of Plants," in 1790, he intimated that a mysterious law indicated the interrelation and common descent of all plants from one primeval type. And in his "Metamorphosis of Animals," he made the same claims in regard to the origin of animals. This was but a return of the human mind, after a long and fruitless drift around a circle, to the ideas of the Grecian natural philosophers. But now the facts for an empirical proof of this theory were within reach, and were soon to be marshalled against the Mosaic theories, which had dominated the human mind since the advent of the medieval church to power.

In 1809, Lamarck came forth with his "*Philosophie Zoologique*" and developed the theory of natural evolution systematically. He struck first of all a crushing blow at the metaphysical conception of the mysterious nature of life, which the naturalists of the 18th century had attributed to a supernatural vital force. He opposed this idea of vitalism by the theory that the primeval ancestors of living beings on this globe were the simplest organisms imaginable and were generated spontaneously by the interaction of physical causes, as soon as the globe had cooled sufficiently. Half a century later, such simple organisms were actually discovered, and still fifty years later the first life processes were produced by mechanical means in the laboratory.

According to Lamarck, those simple primeval organisms were gradually transformed through changes in their conditions of life, leading to the greater use of some and to the disuse of other organs, to adaptations to changed environments, and to the transmission of new characters thus acquired by way of heredity. Similar ideas were advanced by Geoffroy Saint Hilaire and Oken. The misfortune of these pioneers of resurrected evolution was, that the palaeontological and embryological material for the substantiation of this theory was not yet sufficient to silence the opposition. And as the new ideas were at once violently assailed by reactionary thought, the champions of the new science had a hard stand. When Cuvier, the founder of comparative anatomy, challenged Geoffroy Saint Hilaire, in 1830, to a public debate, the

old ideas of the Mosaic creation theory carried the day and remained victors for thirty years longer.

But the general results of Cuvier's own specialty, comparative anatomy, led to the elaboration of a natural system of classification, which stands as an eloquent proof of the interrelation of forms claimed by Lamarck. And the flimsy foundation of Cuvier's arguments was further shaken by the progress in other lines of science. In 1830, Lyell established the proofs of imperceptible and continuous development in geology and pulled the crude catastrophic theory of Cuvier to shreds. And Humphrey Davy had already suggested in 1809, that matter might be of a much more complex structure than was generally assumed. He also intimated that matter might become radiant through very great velocity. Faraday made similar statements in 1816, but his work "On the Magnetization of Light and the Illumination of the Magnetic Lines of Force" did not appear until 1845. Ten years later he discovered the laws of electrolysis. These steps led directly to the theory of electrons and ions, and with these charged particles of matter the entire theory of atoms assumed a new aspect. Light and heat, electricity and magnetism, now appeared as very close relatives, and it required but a few steps more to establish the identity of all life's phenomena with electricity, magnetism, and radiation.

These conditions were at once reflected in philosophy. It was Hegel whose works marked the next milestone after Kant. Hegel's "Phenomenology of the Mind" appeared in 1817. His "Science of Logic" followed in 1812-16, his "Encyclopedia of Philosophical Sciences" in 1817, his "Philosophy of Right" and "Philosophy of Religion" in 1821, and his maturest work, the "Philosophy of History," in 1827. This last work differs from all previous historical works by its distinct recognition of evolution, although it does not understand the means by which the evolution of human societies is brought about. From now on, the world and society were regarded dialectically, that is to say as a succession of processes following one out of another. Things were no longer mere *static*, but also *dynamic and dialectic*.

But unfortunately, the mystical ideas were still predominating. The reaction after the French revolution had produced a profound dissatisfaction with materialism in the bourgeois mind, and as natural science had not yet permitted the materialist evolutionists to triumph, the indescribable longing of the bourgeoisie for the consolations of idealism and mysticism impressed itself on the thinkers of the day in a very forcible manner, especially since the proletariat was showing a decided affinity for materialism and plain speech. Too late did the French and German bourgeois realize, what the English capitalist class had understood a

hundred years before, namely that "religion must be preserved for the people."

Under these circumstances, Hegel became an idealist. To him the life processes of the human brain, the production and realization of ideas, appeared as the evolution of *The Absolute Idea*, of the absolute mind, which was the real and only ruler of the universe, while the things which the human mind perceived, and this mind itself, were but unreal imaginations of the Absolute Idea. Of course Hegel had also to analyze Kant's proofs for the existence of a god, as well as the proofs of the metaphysicians and theologians, in order to establish his theory. He made short work of them all by turning them upside down. Kant had declared, that there must be a god, because his existence could not be proven by means of the things which were in this world of human perceptions. Hegel, on the contrary declared, that there must be a god, because the things of this world had no real existence, and because the Absolute Idea alone was real. And the theologians, on their part, had furnished a third proof for the existence of a god by declaring that he must be there, because the world exists in reality. In short, the human mind, in spite of all scientific progress, was still groping around blindly in the same old contradictory circle. But this maze of contradictions was heralded by the ruling class as the most sublime wisdom, and disseminated by the leaders of thought with the zeal of fanatics. If any proletarian thinker attempted to establish the truth of his theories by such methods, he would be considered a fit companion for the inmates of a lunatic asylum. The most unreal and phantastic ideas were hailed as inspired, and the simplest matter of fact truths assailed as hair-brained imaginations. The classic German school after Hegel, represented by men like Schelling, Fichte, and Schopenhauer, never got out of this labyrinth.

ERNEST UNTERMANN.

(To be Continued.)

The American Marseillaise.

Ye sons of liberty, defenders
Of freedom and of deathless Right,
Again the Lord of sabaoth tenders
The flaming sword and bids you fight.
Behold the poor, and hear their cries!
Behold the poor, and hear their cries!
Shall usurers bind our babes in fetters
Which keep the landless life-long slaves,
And even grudge us room for graves?
Shall workers be perpetual debtors?
Unite, ye hosts of toil,
Unite to live or die;
Strike down the hands that now despoil,
Strike, all, for victory.

Here, here where Liberty first lightened
And freedom spoken shook the world,
Where hope for all the humble brightened
And mightiest kings were backward hurled
Lo here, where equal rights are pledged,
Lo here, where equal rights are pledged,
Are kings with all their brood of curses!
In this broad land, by blood made free,
Dependent millions bend the knee
And plead with tears for sovran mercies!
Unite, ye hosts, etc.

With "vested rights!" flung in our faces
They trample down the people's will!
They crowd the millions from their places,
And call on hireling hordes to kill!
Above the earth they sit enthroned!
Above the earth they sit enthroned!
And sweep their realm with hunger scourges!
They drive the poor from Nature's stores;
For greater gain they lock the doors,
And dare the crowd that round them surges!
Unite, ye hosts, etc.

They claim the ways which commerce uses,
As bold highwaymen robbing all;
They grasp exchange, and each refuses
Its use till all before him fall.
The people now are ruled by gold,
By landlords, trusts and bankers' gold!
But shall we here be made the minions
Of kings on freedom's sacred soil;
Or earn them wealth by slavish toil,
And meekly wear their galling pinions?
Unite, ye hosts, etc.

Once more, once more are heroes waking,
As dawns a righteous day foretold,
And marching forth their cry is shaking
The hideous shapes of evils old;
By all, for all, our laws shall be!
By all, for all, our laws shall be!
The forming hosts of honest labor
Shall give to each his place, his part,
His manhood worth in every mart,
And neighbor live at peace with neighbor.
Unite, ye hosts, etc.

Chicago.

GEORGE HOWARD GIBSON.

The Glorification of Work.

THE industrial development of the nineteenth century imprints itself on every social phenomenon. The nearer the completion of the structure of capitalism the greater is its influence felt in all social phenomena and in its final development it must determine humanity's entire thought and action.

In its first manifestation capitalism encountered both anger and scorn. The first great social result of the growth of capitalism was the *French Revolution*, for in the last analysis, the Revolution was but the struggle of the middle class for the establishment of a free competitive wage-system. Afterwards in England *Chartism and Trade-Unionism* began to struggle against the new form of a developing capitalism. The great economic changes as the result of increasing use of machinery transformed the thought of the times. Scientific researches were made concerning the new methods of production and especially regarding its social effects. *Fourier, Saint-Simon and Comte*, in France, and *Robert Owen* in England keenly analyzed the societies of the past and present and speculated on the society of the future. Fourier and Owen tried to realize their ideas in practice. Owen's Society of the Pioneers of Rochdale was born. But as the economic movements of the time were themselves slow and hesitating in aims and means so these Utopian dreams could give no key to the correct recognition of society.

But capitalism grew apace. *Engels* published his "Condition of the Working Classes in England in 1844" and founded the modern method of social scientific investigation. Soon afterward the "Communist Manifesto" appeared the joint work of *Marx and Engels* and it was the first expression of the workingmen's mission.

Capitalism grows and revolutions sweep the outgrown feudal systems of Europe. Capitalism grows and writers feel its poisonous breath. *Turgenev, Dostojewski, Hauptmann, Ibsen, Bjornson, Zola and Walt Whitman* showed in their writings how they were influenced more and more by the destructiveness of capitalism and how they were driven, involuntarily perhaps, to revolt; they open up the great flood of modern radical literature. But they stumbled for they were not guided by a great all-embracing principle; a great philosophy was not yet known to them by means of which the individual and social problem was to be solved.

Capitalism grows. It breaks into the family and destroys it;

it transforms homes, changes the site of cities and makes new landscapes, creates entirely new classes, it even alters men's faces and the expression of women and children. And the artists, yielding so easily to impressions, begin to embody the new martyrdom of man. *Antoine Wiertz* pictured the crimes of society, the destruction of disease and war; *Charles de Groux* especially became the delineator of human suffering; his "Drunkard" pictures with terrifying reality the misery of family life. Then *Leon Frederic* described, in his "Chalk-Miners," with overwhelming earnestness the vicious circle of misery: in the morning the family go, tired and silently, to work; at noon, tired and silently, they sit down to their dinner of rotten potatoes, and in the evening they return, tired and silently, to the city. Then *Steinlen* descended into the slums of Paris and brought to the light innumerable varieties of depravity and degradation.

Capitalism grows. It corrupts politics, prostitutes universities, churches and schools, enslaves art and literature, poisons the life in its simplest manifestation. Finally there was a revolt and a challenge to the destructiveness of capitalism, the working class organized for resistance. Socialism was born. When capitalism became an international institution the small and hesitating movements of men and their indefinite thoughts coalesced into one great movement holding the same great ideal.

Socialism grows. The classics of socialist science and literature appear. The socialist movement gains in political and economic influence. And soon the new view-point, the world aspect, the philosophy of solidarity, became practically and scientifically a fact. And man was born anew. MAN the socialist, the har-binger of society's economic and ethical development.

Socialism grows. The rotation begins anew, but *reversed*. First capitalism transformed society and produced socialism; now, socialism is transforming society and exterminating capitalism. Social institutions, man, art, literature, everything is being transformed co-incidentally with the increasing political and economical influence of socialism. Man has realized that not only the economic problem but all ideals and sentiments find their solution in socialism. Involuntarily so, because it is a natural law; and voluntarily so in so far as we perceive that it is a natural law and work with it rather than resist it.

In the socialist we recognize the germ of a new human type. We see a new world in process of development: the socialist society. The socialist is not only a man, he is a fellowman! And his manner of association with his fellowman of to-day permits us to forecast the future society. His feeling of solidarity and his wish to live a harmonious life are constantly gaining in importance as social factors until finally they become the essential factors in the evolution of society.

Entire classes of men are penetrated by these germs of evolution; consequently they are forced to express and manifest them. The great principle of human solidarity begins to work. University professors preach the truth of socialism: Ferri, Menger, Sombart, York Powell and many others. Inventors, like Tesla, hold before men's eyes the future happiness of mankind. Artists no longer desire to picture the sufferings of mankind, but try to construct the future of society based upon the socialist movement and the future man from the type of the socialist. They find constructive elements in the socialist movement, which are far more inspiring than the destructive capitalistic forces. Not the fall of man but the revival of man has become the center of their interest.

Zola himself has gone through this development. *L'Assomoir*, *Germinal*, *Travail*, *The Working of the Evils of Society*, *The Germination of a New Society*; *The New Society*, are keystones in his own as well as in society's development. Here, a practical man, a Hyndman receives an inspiration from the socialist movement; there, an artistic soul of a William Morris, a Walter Crane and an Oscar Wilde become spiritualized by the great ethical and esthetic possibilities of Socialism. Anatole France—undoubtedly the greatest writer to-day in France—draws the elixir of his life and work from the blossoming beauty of socialist action and thought.

Thus we realize involuntarily the emptiness of the saying: "*L'Art pour L'Art*." Because we now cannot help but see that society is an organism consisting of interdependent cells and the moment a cell separates itself from the social organism it must perish. There are not, there can not be, living isolated cells; there are no isolated social entities. Every cell is the supporter of every other cell and all support each other. Everything and everybody is a means to life and further development of itself and of all society. Art can not be but such a means. It is impossible to imagine art as an independent cell, nourishing itself from itself, as a private passion of an artist. The artist, as well as his art, is a product of society, therefore both are bound psychologically to serve society. Art never existed for Art's sake alone, but has always supported the desire and ideals of its age; supported and expressed them—positively or negatively—by means of the highest form possible.

The greatness of art lies in its capacity to see things more embracingly, to recognize beauties lying beyond the grasp of the average beholder and to compel him to see and enjoy the beauties it discovered. A great artist is, and will always be, one who expresses with the most far-sighted vision the characteristics of his age, those characteristics, of course, which are of eternal value either in beauty or power or in both. Art for Art's sake is the phrase of the false artist who does not feel and understand the

forces of his time and who can produce but monotonous "figures" or "sweet" happenings. His art is dead. The true artist feels, and understands the social forces and sees their future development and he tries to enlarge and beautify them in his soul. His inspiration is unlimited. His vision, strengthened and intoxicated with living issues, draws him to original and perhaps to eternal creation. For anything which moved mankind and lived with it is eternally engraved in its life.

This then is the attitude of great artists and writers toward social forces and social life. To have a true conception of social forces—to enlarge the same in their own spiritual life—and finally to express the matured thought in an artistic form, for the sake of beauty. This is their function. The artist's imagination, his force, his sense of beauty, his cleverness has an unlimited field for development, but only this psychological transformation—the conception of social forces—gives him a real basis for artistic creation. Art can only realize its task—the beautifying of life—when it rests upon this ground—and then it may give to man those new ideas and forces of beauty which, with its far-reaching sense, it realizes to be innate in man's soul.

The development of *Constantin Meunier*, who undoubtedly was the greatest sculptor of our time, proves very clearly the influence of social changes on an artist's soul. Meunier was born in a suburb of Brussels in 1837. His parents and all his family were very poor. He showed at a very early age an intense feeling for art and as a boy he went to Brussels to the Academy where he copied with great enthusiasm from the antique. But he soon realized the unprofitable nature of this and he saw that he could never thus accomplish great and original work when led by the dead ideal of a past age. The conventional spirit and aimless admiration of the antique no longer could satisfy him for they did not represent the living beauty of the life of his own day. Impelled by a melancholy temperament and influenced by his poverty and the misery of his environment, he followed his friend De Groux and depicted scenes of suffering and sadness. He began with religious pictures, but the spirit of the Time conquered him and his art was saved.

The smoke of factories, the roar and throb of machinery, the mining of coal, the workingmen's dangers, the miner's risk, the incessant work of the farmer, the monumentality of the dock-laborers' work—all, all appealed to his senses and moulded his soul. He began to feel the struggle of the workingman and finally devoted all his art to depict this struggle. His strong pastels prove how magnificently he identified himself with the spirit of the working masses.

But Meunier's eyes were opened. He saw that suffering and heroic risk are not the only characteristics of the working-

men. He realized that suffering even made them stronger by compelling them to unite with their fellow-workers and he saw that this union produced a higher moral consciousness and elevated their ethical standard. It was a revelation to Meunier; the tendencies of his time and those of the future were now clear to him. From the close and dark air of the factory and mine was unfolded to him the magnificent strength and social consciousness of the workingman.

The metamorphosis of Meunier was completed. First he was an "*L'Art pour L'Art's*" adherent, monotonously copying, then the painter and sculptor of the "Poor-People," picturing the hopeless tragedy of their lives, and finally he became conscious of the reconstructive social and individual forces and embodied them in the powerful form of the self-conscious workingman.

Among the products of this last influence is his "*Miner*," a young, strong man, swinging a hammer. The tremendous blow which he is directing is keenly expressed in his whole body and face. The strength applied to swing his body is concentrated in his muscular back. His feet, his shoulders, his neck, his eyes, all, participate in the blow. Labor is here represented in the same sense as the noblest gymnastic by the ancient masters; as the only preserver of human strength and vigor.

His "*Reaper*" is the modern Gladiator. His strength makes his work but a trifle for him to cope with. He defiantly surveys the broad field with his sharp eyes!

His "*Dock-Laborer*" is a strong, proud worker. He stands upright, at rest. His hands are resting on his hips. His face is dignified. His attitude reflects the consciousness of strength, that magnificent strength which is increased by repose, which makes him able to carry the heaviest load on his iron shoulders, as a feather. Consciousness, proud self-consciousness, is in this labor giant.

Whether Meunier pictures the miner, the farmer or the fisherman he always glorifies strength and consciousness. Like the keystone of his activity is his unfinished monument, "*The Glorification of Labor*." The four sides of the colossal foundation will be ornamented with bas-relief, each representing a different manifestation of industry.

At the four corners of the base are four figures, one of which, "*The Maternity*," is the great Saint-Image of modern times: a mother with her two boys. "*The Reapers*," one of the four reliefs, represents agriculture. Oppressive heat prevails. The glowing sunbeams fall directly on the reapers. Four figures, cutting, proceed the others. Following are men and women, binding the sheaves. Near to them an ox is eating the fresh grain. Simplicity and earnestness dominate the whole. Never hitherto in

sculpture has such work and motion, such air and force, such sun and heat been expressed.

The magnificent statue, the symbolic figure of the "Sower" sprinkling the "fructifying seeds," which stands on the base and looks at us majestically, represents the unlimited power which is the result of the co-operation of work and force, of nature and man.

In the works of *Jean Francois Millet* the fragrant and smiling spring, clad in luxurious colors, intoxicates the worker. The fertile earth, overflowing with force, overwhelms him. The characteristic of Millet is: "*Le cri de la Terre*"—"The Cry of the Earth." The superiority of the earth and nature over man. The work of man does not harmonize with the work of nature. The earth is the commanding power. Man must obey, he must surrender to this power.

"*The cry of force*," "*The Voice of Consciousness*," is the master spirit in Meunier's work. Man and nature are not subordinated but co-ordinated to each other. They are harmonizing and co-operative forces. The wonderful touch of nature makes man a higher being, conscious of his faculties. Nature and work do not overpower him, but elevate him and multiply his forces and abilities, set a broader scope to his work and show him that his force and labor is just as creative a power as is nature itself.

Thus Meunier expresses his philosophy, which recognizes in force and work the animating and supporting elements of society. He discarded the old way of attracting people's interest; the agitator's voice, speaking from the pictures of the "poor-people," disappeared. Cheap inartistic effects were avoided and the eternal truth brought forth by purely artistic forms, by the rhythm of beauty found when force and action work consciously with man. The beauty of Meunier's art is in its originality and sublime simplicity; his art is unlimited, is eternal because it embraces the eternal verities.

Meunier died in March, 1905, accompanied by the love and sorrow of all who love art and all who love a noble man and who struggle for the salvation of mankind.

At the grave his friend *Stacquet* said: "*We loved you, Meunier, for your glorious eyes, which were full of goodness; we loved you for your great heart, which was full of sympathy; we loved you, Meunier, for your fine hands, which were full of service. Farewell, Meunier, farewell, my poor Meunier!*"

ODON POR.

The Political Side of Economics.

POLITICS and Economics are the obverse and reverse sides of industrial life. Conflicting material interests are the basis of social strife. Political parties are the expression of conflicting economic interests. The importance and fervidness of political campaigns are in direct ratio to the magnitude of the material interests involved. Political parties sometimes represent interests within interests, and these subordinate interests are represented by "Political Reform" parties.

The economic interests represented by the different political parties when understood by the voters, enable the latter to deposit their ballots for the candidates of such parties as represent their own particular interests.

Socialists address their propaganda of principles to the working class, primarily, because Socialism is the political expression of the interests of the exploited working class. It is the labor of the workers, combined with the multiplied factors of modern civilization in the machinery of production, that produces from the bosom of Mother Earth all the wealth of the world. The wealth thus produced is appropriated by the few through the wage system, with its corollaries of Rent, Interest and Profit.

Socialists point out that these are the respectable and legal methods by which Labor is despoiled of its product. Legal, because the class that now owns the means of production and distribution of the things necessary to human life also own the law making powers and control the courts; laws are *always* made and administered *in the interest of the owning class*: respectable, because the morals of each epoch in history serve only to reflect the economic interests of the master class in that epoch.

The only consideration the working class enjoys at the hands of the dominant class in society today is that its members shall be permitted to retain of the product of their toil sufficient for mere subsistence, and this only because of the necessity to perpetuate their kind. This is what is known as "The iron law of wages."

The present capitalist class having obtained possession of the means of wealth production, and its tenure thereto strengthened by the laws of the capitalist regime, and the capitalist class

being comparatively few numerically, the only commodity left to the worker that he can sell in order to have access to the means of wealth production, and which access thereto he *must have* in order to live, is his *laboring power*. In exchange for his laboring power, which he surrenders unconditionally to the owning class, he is given wages. Wages represents only a part of the product of his toil; the other part the owner keeps and calls "Profit." The worker is under the absolute necessity of thus selling himself, because he has no other means of making a living, and is thus constituted a slave—a "wage slave."

Profit, or the surplus product of the workers' toil appropriated by the capitalist owner, is the unpaid wages of labor, and is that of which the worker is *robbed*. The capitalists, the robber class, utilize the wealth thus unjustly filched from the workers by re-investment in dividend drawing stocks and bonds representing additional ownership in the means of life—land, mills, factories, railroads, etc., from which interest is yielded, and rent, enabling them to live in idleness as social parasites—the tramps' apotheosis.

The working class being numerically greater than the number required for the operation of the means of production under the methods of present social order, a vast number of the workers are left deprived of the means of obtaining employment—are deprived of even the poor privilege of being wage slaves. These are called "Capital's Reserve Army of the Unemployed."

Laboring power being a commodity, and as such subject to the laws of trade under capitalist society, the price of labor is forced down by competition between the laborers to the point where actual subsistence only may be maintained. If discontent arises among the slaves who are fortunate enough to have employment and a strike for "higher wages," that is to say a larger part of their product than their owners allow them, Capital's reserve army of the unemployed are available by the tens of thousands to be put in the places of their discontented fellow workers. In the face of these conditions the unions of the A. F. of L. type are utterly powerless.

The axiomatic basis of socialist philosophy is that in every age the institutions of society must conform to the prevailing methods of production. This is what is known as the philosophy of Material Determinism. The simple tools of our forbears have developed into complex machines driven by steam and electricity. In this age humanity is essentially interdependent. Machinery has specialized the labor of the working class. Labor, formerly functioning in the individual through the simple tool of produc-

tion, now functions in the collectivity through the complexity of that tool developed into the machine, and wealth, from an individual product, has become the product of the collectivity—a social product.

In the days when the simple tool was owned by the individual worker the product was his, and he enjoyed a measure of economic freedom. There was comparatively little industrial friction, and "competition" was "the life of trade." In this age the tool, which is now the complex machine of socialized productivity, has passed out of the possession of the class that uses it and into the possession of the class who do not use it; and here is where the conflict of interest centers between the working class and the owning class.

This antagonism and the resultant conflict is called "The Class Struggle," and this struggle is destined to grow in intensity until the ownership of the tools of production is restored to the class that uses them. This change of ownership will restore harmony in the relations of human society, and it is necessary in order that the integrity of the human race may be preserved and its progressive development insured.

The working class dispossessed of the means of life in the machinery of production are known as the expropriated proletariat. Into this class the present middle class of society is rapidly being forced by the same laws that operated to dispossess the former owners of the simpler tools and the resources of life. The fate of the "middle class" is as absolutely certain as the inherence of cosmic law in the order of the universe.

The Socialist political movement of the working class recognizes the interest of every worker in the world as being essentially identical with the interest of every other worker, irrespective of race, color or nationality, and the united interests of the workers are opposed at every point to the interests of those who have constituted themselves the guardians of the present social order, hence all political parties not committed to the Socialist Program.

There being no common ground of agreement between Capitalism and Socialism, the interests of each being diametrically opposed, the socialist political movement takes its stand on the platform of the class struggle, and its mission is to educate the working class to an understanding of the identity of their interests, and to solidarity of action at the ballot box, for the overthrow of the existing social order by the capture of the powers of government. The governmental powers once seized they shall be utilized to replace the present quasi-political system of capitalist institutionalism by an industrial regime in which the machinery of production will become the collective property of the people, and wealth will be produced under a sane and

sensible system without waste and for the use of the people willing to render each his or her quota of social service, and there shall be no such thing as profit in such industry.

In this, then, the Socialist Republic, the hour of service rendered will be used as the measure of value in the exchange of products; machinery will be used to lighten toil and shorten the hours of labors for ALL the workers instead of intensifying the labor and consuming the vitality of the few for a wage pittance as is now done; the army of the unemployed will then have disappeared; the hopeless struggle for existence that obtains under the existing system will have ceased, and there will be guaranteed TO EVERY HUMAN BEING the right to life, liberty and the realization of all the happiness that the most favorable economic conditions can afford.

WORD H. MILLS.

Dallas, Texas, March 16, 1905.

I. Socialist and Socialism.

THE words socialist and socialism were introduced into economic discussion by L. Reybaud, in 1840, in his *'Etudes sur les Reformateurs ou Socialistes Modernes.'*¹ "

This was the opinion of the eminent authority on socialism, Dr. Richard T. Ely, expressed in his French and German Socialism in Modern Times, written in 1883, and for twenty years the statement has been quoted in cyclopedias, dictionaries and treatises upon socialism as authoritative and final.²

Since these words were in use much earlier than 1840, we have here an interesting illustration of how an error perpetuates itself. And an error of this character is quite pardonable when no controversy sharpens the critical sense of readers and recruits the labor and energy of an army of inquiring minds to ransack all conceivable places for information—each spurred by curiosity, the zeal of first discovery, or the joy of refutation. Consider the magnitude, and for any one man the impossibility, of ascertaining the very first printed use of the word "horse" in English, spelled in this manner, for instance; the hundreds of thousands of pages that must be turned, the millions of words the eye must scrutinize. Hence it is wholly legitimate to rely upon current opinion rather than to indulge in laborious research to fix upon the initial publication date of a word of even very modern origin. In these days the horizon of serviceable inquiry is so far-spread that no qualified thinker can excuse himself in the waste of the fleeting hours of a short life over non-essentials.

However, with socialism looming large in the world's thought, growing in Germany, a political force in France; with socialist parties yearly growing in importance in the United States; with margin-ideas, such as municipal ownership, questions of widespread discussion and dispute; with the prophecy of the late Senator Hanna still ringing in our ears that the next great American political struggle would be over socialism—for all these reasons, the earliest uses of the term are of historical

¹ Ely, French and German Socialism, p. 29 note.

² Century Dictionary, art. "Socialism."

"To this industrial order the term Socialism was first applied by Reybaud, a French writer, in 1839. The word, however, originated in England a few years earlier in connection with the Owen Movement." Sprague, Socialism from Genesis to Revelation, (Boston, 1893), p. 3.

interest and not without value in viewing the evolution of industrial society.

Quite naturally, the insistent assertion of L. Reybaud that he originated the term socialism has been widely accepted.^{3 4} Reybaud, however, clearly admits the currency of these words at least in England at the time he "coined" the new term in his book.^{5 6 7} The first edition of his "Studies of the Reformers" was published in 1840, probably composed during the year 1839.

Other writers have been quite sure that to Pierre Leroux belongs the honor of having coined the terms somewhere about the year 1832.^{8 9 10 11 12}

As late as 1848 the term socialism, however, was little known in France, as indicated by an incident related of Proudhon: "After the Days of June in 1848, Proudhon said to the magistrate who examined him, that he went to contemplate 'the sublime horrors of the cannonade.'" "But," said the magistrate, "are you a socialist?" "Certainly." "Well, but what, then, is Socialism."¹³

A large number of writers also credit Robert Owen with

³ "Les illusions de ce genre sont devenues si contagieuses, si generales de notre temps, qu'elles ont merite les honneurs d'un nom nouveau et desormais consacrer: c'est celui de socialisme en autres l'art d'improviser des societes irreprochables." (Reybaud, Etudes, etc., 2nd ed. 1848. 1st ed. pub. in 1840.)

⁴ "L. Reybaud a en 1864 (Pref. de la 7e ed. des Reformateurs reclame la priorite.) V. aussi Socialisme, dans l'ancien Dictionn. de l'econ. politique." Note p. 1, Socialisme, Communisme et Collectivisme, par Eugene d'Eichthal, Paris, 1892.

⁵ Robert Owen, presented to the Queen in January 1846, and as a result "Leveque d'Exeter se fit remarquer par une sortie fouqueuse contre le chef des socialistes." Notes in Reybaud, p. 402.

⁶ Socialism of the modern type began in 1817, the year when Robert Owen laid before Parliament his plan for a socialistic community. Is first used in connection with the later agitation of Robert Owen from 1830-1840; and first popularized by Reybaud (1840)." Bliss Cyc. of Social Reform, art. "Socialism."

⁷ The term was soon afterwards borrowed by a distinguished French writer, Reybaud, in his well known work, The Reformateurs Modernes, in which he discovered the theories of St. Simon, Fourier and Owen. Through Reybaud it soon gained wide currency on the continent and is now the accepted historic name for one of the most remarkable movements of the 19th Century." Kirkup, History of Socialisme, 1892.

⁸ "The term, applied in its modern sense, was first used by Reybaud, a French writer, originated in England a few years earlier in connection with the Owen Movement." Sprague, F. M., supra.

⁹ "Il fut cree en 1838 par Pierre Leroux." L. Reybaud — adopta immediately a neologism of Pierre Leroux." Malon, Histoire du Socialisme.

¹⁰ The term socialism, as opposed to individualism, was coined by Pierre Leroux, in 1833 (cf. La Grande Cyclopedie) which was adopted by Reybaud in 1840. All seem to agree. Dict. Pol. Econ.

¹¹ "Celui-ci pretend avoir le premier 'forge' le mot en France vers 1833 (V. la Greve de Samarez, 1863, p. 255 et 365) mais il ne donne pas d'indication precise." Eichthal, supra. p. 1 note.

¹² "Le mot Socialisme a ete employe pour la premiere fois en 1832 par Pierre Leroux, d'une maniere vague, comme oppose individualisme; Owen en 1835 employe d'une maniere plus precise pour designer la transformation communiste de l'organisation economique dans l'interet des travailleurs." La Grande Encyclopedie, v. 30 p. 119.

¹³ Das Wort Socialismus stammt von Pierre Leroux, der, wie er sagte, das Wort schmiedete in Opposition gegen den Individualismus" u. s. w. Handbuch des Socialismus p. 752, (Zurich, 1897).

¹⁴ Woolsey, T. D., Communism and Socialism, 1886.

the introduction of the words into literature and language—though with great variety in the specification of the dates.^{14 15 16 17}

Certain it is, however, some of the Owenites called themselves "socialists" during the years 1835-36,¹⁸ and both socialist and socialism are used without quotation marks, indicating the acceptance of the terms at least within the cult of the Owen Movement. In June 1835 a Mr. Henderson began his address to an assemblage with the words: "Friends and Socialists."¹⁹

In the "Comrade" for March, 1903, however, Mr. John Spargo points out probably the first published use of the term socialist, under the date of August 24, 1833, as follows:

"It is to Robert Owen that the imperishable honor of having 'coined' these words (socialism and socialist) is by common consent ascribed; but, singularly enough, although all the contemporaries acknowledged him as the author of the words, and he himself, I believe, claimed the honor, the first instance on record of the use of the word in print is by an unknown writer. In 1831 Henry Hetherington, the well known English Pioneer Chartist, in his fight for a free 'unstamped' press, began the publication of a paper called 'The Poor Man's Guardian,' a 'Weekly Paper, for the People, published in defiance of Law, to Try the Power of Might against Right,' and in this paper on the 24th of August, 1833, appeared a letter signed 'A Socialist.' No earlier instance of the word has, I believe, ever been found. The phraseology of this letter is that of the early Owen agitation and it is quite evident that its author used the word Socialist as a synonym for 'Owenite,' the name popularly given to Robert Owen's followers. The general opinion is that the new word had been used and to some extent popularized by Owen in his propaganda before this appearance of it in print."²⁰

¹⁴ "Le mot socialisme, employé d'abord en Angleterre dans les publications des disciples de Robert Owen. — A l'occasion de la fondation sous les auspices d'Owen de 'The Association of all classes of all nations.' (1835) v. Encyc. Brit., art. 'Socialism.' Eichthal p. 1 supra.

¹⁵ "The term Socialism was first used at a public meeting, May 1, 1835, at which time the Association of all Classes of all Nations was formed. The members came to be known as Socialists." Holyorke History of Cooperation VI. p. 210.

¹⁶ "A specimen of the manner in which what was called Socialism of the day was combatted was published at that time as having been sung at St. Phillip's Sunday School Salford on Whit Monday May 23, 1831." Jones, L., The Life, Times and Labours of Robert Owen, London, 1890.

¹⁷ "The word is of comparatively recent origin having been coined in England in 1835." — "Robert Owen founded the Socialist Association of All Nations." Reybaud, in Reformateurs Modernes, 1839. It is interesting to note that it has been claimed that it was first used in 1846 by Reybaud in his Etudes." (Encyc. Brit.) This shows the lack of a definite idea of the word as early as 1846.

¹⁸ We announce that 5001 have been sent — to being a school for the children of Socialists. New Moral World, Mar. 31, 1835, No. 180. Also see ib., Mar. 12, 1836, p. 163; April 16, p. 196; May 21, p. 240; June 11, p. 264; July 2, p. 288 (When SOCIALIST shall have left off imputing unworthy to his friends," etc.

¹⁹ "Notices" to Correspondence etc.)

²⁰ New Moral World Saturday, June 27, 1835, p. 273.

²¹ "Socialism and Social Democracy: the Origin of our Names," in 'The Comrade,' V. 2, No. 6, p. 135, March 1903; see 'The Poor Man's Guardian,' No. 116, Saturday, August 24, 1833 p. 275. 'Library: Univ. of Wis. Ju. 45. p. 79.)

It is a curious coincidence that after thus finding what may well be the original article in which the term "Socialist" is launched, investigation is baffled by the impossibility of identifying the anonymous writer. At any rate diligent scrutiny of the voluminous literature of the Owenite Movement reaching back to 1817 has so far failed to reveal an earlier use of the term.

The French State Socialist, Louis Blanc, who became one of the editors of "Le Bon Sens," in 1835, at the age of twenty-one,²¹ may have made an earlier use of the term, but that he actually did is not regarded as probable.²² To the unknown enthusiast, therefore, for the present at least, we must credit the origin of the term "Socialist" and out of it, "Socialism."

II. COMMUNIST AND COMMUNISM.

The term Communism (Fr. *Communisme* from *commun*, common, from Latin *communis*, common) is currently believed to be a much older term than Socialism. "Socialism, should be sharply distinguished from Communism, which is an older term."²³ It would be somewhat surprising if this were not the case. "All historical nations, so far as known, at one time held their land in common, the individual having only the use of a portion of it for a certain period. A survival still exists in the Russian Mir."²⁴ The agitation to found a new social order upon some communistic basis reaches as far back into history as Plato—back, it might perhaps be said, to the time when humanity first emerged from the communism of the patriarchal group.²⁵

Careful search through the publications of St. Simon, who died in 1825, and through the early communistic writers in England, such as Owen, may yet reveal an early use of the term. Indeed, it seems very probable that some more generic term than "St. Simonian Family" would have been applied by publicists discussing the movement, at least as the movement came into such wide public notice in France in 1830-32.^{26 27}

²¹ Ely supra p. 151.

²² Sprague, supra p. 151.

²³ *Ib.*, p. 3.

²⁴ New Int. Cyc. vol. V, p. 87.

²⁵ "We certainly want a true history of socialism, meaning by that a history of every systematic attempt to provide a new social existence for the mass of the workers." Harrison, new social existence for the mass of the workers. Harrison, F., quoted in Webster's Dictionary, art. "Socialism."

²⁶ After his (St. Simon's) death his disciples formed an association called the St. Simonian family, which after the revolution of 1830, rose rapidly into notoriety and favor. With the notions common to many other social reformers the members of this association united the doctrine that the division of goods be "according to proportion, etc." Practical difficulties arose in carrying the scheme into execution, and, in 1832, the Association was dispersed by the French Government. Worcester's Dict., (1832) art. "Socialism."

²⁷ Professor Commons of the University of Wisconsin is authority for the statement that the word "agrarianism" was the term applied during the early part of the 19th century to advocates of socialism and communism.

The same expectation of a general descriptive term might be sought for in the early discussions of and about Robert Owen, "who founded the abortive experimental communities of Orbiston in Lanarkshire (1823)," etc.²⁸ What did Owen himself call these communities? In 1829 in public discussions he refers to "communities" but makes no use of the term "communism."²⁹ As late as 1836, Owen still used, and somewhat cumbrously, the word "community" where had the word "communism" been in his vocabulary it would certain seem that he would have used it. For instance, he says: "It is my intention to stay at Birmingham — — and if we are only in good earnest about the matter, they must think, and cannot help it, that we mean what we say, and are determined of attaining our object — Community."³⁰

Not until 1840 have the present investigators found usage of the terms communist and communism. M. Reybaud in his *Studies of the Reformers* mentions communism as a term used by Pierre Leroux,³¹ and of communists as a term then well understood.

Louis Blanc, in his *Organization of Labor* (*L'Organisation du Travail*) 1839, favored a communistic state, but that he used the specific terms has not been ascertained.³²

Pierre Joseph Proudhon, in his first *Memoir on Property*,³³ uses the term communism in expression of his opinions. "We give them in English in Mr. Benj. R. Ticker's translation: p. 259, 'I ought not conceal the fact that property and communism,' etc., p. 261, 'Communism is inequality, but not as property is.'"³⁴ A writer in 1848. says he conversed with Frenchmen in 1840, and then first pronounced the word communism.³⁵ At the time of the Corn Laws agitation in England the following appeared, which illustrates the apparent absence of clear ideas regarding the terms at that period: "What is a communist? One who hath yearnings for equal division of unequal earnings. Idler or bungler, or both, he is willing to fork out his penny and pocket your shilling."³⁶ But in 1843 works on communists and communism were already on the market.³⁷ By 1850 a *History of Communism* had appeared.³⁸

²⁸ *Globe. Encyc.*, V. 2, p. 213.

²⁹ Owen's *View of Public Discussion*, 1829, p. 230.

³⁰ *New Moral World*, Saturday, May 7, 1836, p. 220.

³¹ "M. Pierre Leroux — prétend qu'après le communisme se réalisera la vraie doctrine de l'égalité," etc. *Etudes supra*, p. 133; "Nos Communistes français constituent une variété de cette nombreuse famille." *Ib.* vol., 2, p. 111.

³² See Murray's *New English Dictionary*, art. "Communism."

³³ Son *memoire* "Qu'est-ce que la propriété?" mark en 1840 son debut dans cette science nouvelle. (*La Grande Cyc.*, art. "Proudhon.")

³⁴ Woolsey, *supra*, p. 11.

³⁵ Goodwyn Barmby in *The Apostle*, No. 1, 1848. (See Murray's *New Eng. Dict.*)

³⁶ *Cyc. Britt.*, VI, p. 211.

³⁷ *The New Age*, May 24, 1843. (Murray's *Dict.*, art. "Communism.")

³⁸ See A. Sudre, *Histoire du Communisme*, 1850. Cited by B. Malon, 1883. Also Fleury: *Babeuf et le Socialisme en 1796*, 1851.

Mr. J. M. Ludlow, in his "Christian Socialism," published in 1851, attempted to distinguish socialism and communism. He said: "Communism starts from *thing* and is in essential antagonistic to property. Socialism starts from *person* and is in essential antagonistic to human discord and rivalry."³⁹

III. CONCLUSION.

The present investigation, subject to further research in foreign publications and libraries and unexpected discoveries in obscure places and publications not heretofore cited by writers on social reform, credits the first published use of the terms 'Socialism' and 'Socialist,' 'Communism,' and 'Communist,' as follows:

I. Socialist and Socialism:

1833. Anonymous Writer, in the Poor Man's Guardian.

II. Communist and Communism:

1840. Reybaud, in his *Etudes sur les Reformateurs*.

University of Wisconsin.

J. E. BAKER. H. M. HIGDAY. D. E. MOWRY.

³⁹ Century Dictionary, art. "Socialism."

EDITORIAL

The Wisconsin Situation.

The article which we publish elsewhere in this issue from Comrade Thompson is a very good sample of the sort of stuff that has made Wisconsin so many enemies. We cull the following choice gems of language as showing his style of argument. His critics "tear their hair and get red in the face," indulge in "carping criticism" and "tirades" or are "American pigmies," "fools," "careless, lazy and indifferent" "doctrinaire and shallow-minded" or are inspired either by "effrontery or stupidity," "intellectual cowardice" or "weakness of youth." When such language as this is constantly used we need not be surprised that the whole Wisconsin situation is being confused by the desire on the part of a great many comrades to "get even" for the insulting abuse that has been poured forth from Milwaukee.

Considering the article on its merits we are struck in the first place with its extremely conceited attitude and mis-statements. We wonder if Wisconsin conceit has quite reached the point where its socialists really believe that they were the first to adopt a municipal platform with immediate demands, or to attempt to discuss the farmer question. It will also be news to thousands of socialists throughout the country, who have never noticed that Milwaukee had a platform, that they are all now engaged in copying that document.

As a fine example of dodging the question Comrade Thompson's article stands in the first rank. His attempt to confuse the present question with a mass of entirely irrelevant stuff seems to indicate that he was conscious of the weakness of the real position under consideration.

His statement that Comrade Berger's action "has been no violation either of the state or national platforms or constitution" is rather naive to say the least. The very condition of membership set forth in the national constitution requires that the party should be made up only of those who have "severed connections with all other political parties." If voting for any political party is not maintaining a connection with it, what is?

And if it is not "compromising with any other party" to advise its support, then what does constitute such compromise?

Yet in spite of all these facts, in spite of the would-be defenders of Wisconsin, which should cause the socialist movement of that state to pray to be delivered from its friends, we have still opposed and shall oppose to the best of our ability any action which will tend to disrupt that organization and shall insist that the action of comrades outside the state should be confined to criticism.

We feel perfectly sure that the present action will never be repeated in spite of the bravado which has been manifested. We know that there has arisen an opposition within the state against such tactics, sufficiently strong to make their repetition dangerous. We believe that it is safe to trust to this internal opposition. We are even optimistic enough to believe that Wisconsin may be sometime educated up to the point where it will not only oppose the tactics that have been disapproved, but it may even be able to conduct a newspaper and a controversy without language that smells of the gutter.

There is just one phase of the argument that has been continually pushed forward by Milwaukee in this connection that is worth attention. This is the statement that they are only following foreign precedents. In one sense of the word that is true. There is probably no Socialist Party in Europe in which a man would be censured for doing what Comrade Berger has just done, and this may well be offered by him as a reason for arguing for such a policy. But it may easily be responded to such an argument that all the reasons which are urged in Europe in support of such action, and which tend to justify it, are absent in America. In no other country in the world are there but two classes struggling for a mastery. In every European country there are still remnants of Feudalism which tend to confuse the lines of the class struggle. Almost every political condition which is used to justify such action in Europe is also absent in America. We have no second elections; we do have universal suffrage and direct representation. Under these conditions it would seem to indicate a rather perverted idea of Marxism to offer the European excuse.

But this question has lead to others very much broader than the original one of whether the Milwaukee Comrades made a mistake in tactics or not. The question now before the members of the Socialist Party is, not so much what will be done with Comrade Berger, as what will be done with the machinery of the Socialist Party, and we protest strongly against the use of the machinery of that party for such petty purposes as that for which some of the members of the party would now seek to use it. We believe that the Socialist Party has become too big to be thrown into a silly panic because one member or even one Local or state has taken a false step. In this connection we can not too highly commend the attitude which has been taken by the New York *Worker* and some of the comrades of that state. It is time that we were able to settle these

questions like men and not like children. The Socialist Party is neither a kindergarten nor an old woman's tea party.

It is time that socialists learned the distinction between discipline and discussion, between disagreement and treason. It is noteworthy that the Locals which have endorsed the Crestline resolutions to cut Wisconsin off from all connection with the National movement are almost all small locals. Their total membership would fall far short of that of Chicago, New York or Milwaukee.

We do not believe that any action by the party is necessary further than the enactment into our National constitution of an article which will make it clearly evident that any such action as that recently taken by Milwaukee is contrary to Socialist principle and tactics. There will then be no excuse for any violation in the future.

THE WORLD OF LABOR

BY MAX S. HAYES

As I have pointed out in previous numbers of the REVIEW, Mr. Samuel Gompers, president of the A. F. of L., is running amuck in a vain attempt to kill off socialism. Because certain people called a convention to meet in Chicago last month to form a new industrial federation he declared that *the* Socialists were attempting to disrupt the A. F. of L. But you don't hear the "fair" Mr. Gompers discussing the peculiar situation that has developed on the Pacific Coast. According to the *Coast Seamen's Journal*, official organ of the sailors' union and a pure and simple sheet, a rump convention of longshoremen, composed of representatives from seven unions, was held in Seattle, Wash., at which a manifesto was prepared and is now being sent to all locals affiliated with the International Longshoremen, Marine and Transport Workers' Association inviting those bodies to join the secession movement. The circular is brim full of denunciation of industrialism as well as President Keefe of the International association, and its authors fervently declare for trade autonomy. The *Coast Seamen's Journal* praises the secessionists in the warmest terms and assures the latter "that the organized seamen will extend every aid in their power to make the new body a success, since in so doing they will not only be rendering service to their fellow-workers, but will also be furthering their own interests in proportion as the new body grows in power to establish and maintain the principles upon which it is founded." I wish to direct two questions at Mr. Gompers in this connection, and I will take pleasure in repeating them at the Pittsburg debate (if he agrees to a discussion, which he has not done up to date): First. Are *the* Socialists attempting to disrupt the longshoremen and transport workers' organization or are perhaps Republican and Democratic brethren in the deal? Secondly. Are not Mr. Gompers' friends, Furuseth, McArthur, Penje, et. al., guilty of treason in encouraging the disruptions? Will Samuel please explain?

Several more "workingman's friends" have displayed their claws during the past few weeks. For instance, when Mr. W. L. Douglass was elected governor of Massachusetts last fall quite a lot of labor leaders, so-called, went off into paroxysms of delight at the great "labor" victory. The first thing that Douglass did after learning of his election was to repudiate the "labor vote," declaring in an interview that the business people had elected him. Probably he regretted the "bar'l" that he was compelled to tap to keep the "flying squadrons" in a proper condition of enthusiasm. Anyhow, he seated himself in the gubernatorial chair and proceeded to "settle" the textile workers' strike in true capitalistic fashion. It will be recalled that some 25,000 men, women and children at Fall River, Mass., had been on strike for six months to resist a reduction of 12½ per cent. in their wages on top of a 10 per cent. cut that had been accepted a

few months previously. The strikers, in order to secure their surrender, were given assurances that the second reduction would probably amount to not more than $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. But Douglass had no further need for labor votes now and so decided as arbitrator that "a partial restoration of wages is not warranted," and therefore the total cut of $22\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. in less than a year stands. It is generally agreed that at the time when the wages in the Massachusetts mills were at the maximum they were hardly sufficient to enable the employes to properly feed, clothe and house themselves, and how they will exist henceforth with prices of necessities at top figures the Lord only knows. Douglass' decision, which means suffering and misery for thousands of poor women and children, was soon followed by a public statement to the effect that the "workingman's friend" would not accept a renomination from the Democratic party. This announcement was probably received with much sadness by the manipulators of the "flying squadrons," who "dragged politics into the unions" last fall, and dirty capitalistic politics at that, for fare you well. I am told that the labor grafters who controlled the "squadrons" denounced and wounded men who refused to vote for the demagogue, Douglass, in a manner that would bring joy to the Peabodys and Parrys, and that one of the rear-admirals received a "present" of \$5,000 from the shoe man. Not only has Douglass refused to be bled again this year by the political boodlers and heelers, but it is intimated that he intends to imitate his fellow plutocrat, Mr. Thomas W. Lawson, and relate something about "frenzied politics" after he leaves office, and how some men are bought like sausages and fish on the wharves. If he makes a clean breast of his political experience a few things may be forgiven "3.50."

Less than two years ago certain "labor leaders" of New York shouted themselves hoarse in proclaiming the many virtues of McClellan, Tammany candidate for mayor. He was a "workingman's friend" who would see that labor obtained its rights, they cried, and anyone who refused to vote for "Little Mac" was an enemy to society. And when McClellan was elected his boosters actually started a Presidential boom for him. Yet, in nearly every instance where organized labor has made a request for fair treatment McClellan has, since landing in office, turned the union people down hard. The worst blow of all was administered a couple of weeks ago, when, after five years of effort, the unions secured the enactment of a law providing for the eight-hour day and a slight increase of wages for street sweepers, drivers and other laborers who now work ten hours a day and seven days a week for \$60 per month. Although \$500,000 had been appropriated just previously by the administration for more pay for high-salaried employes, as well as new jobs, Mayor McClellan vetoed the bill to reduce the hours and raise the wages of the poor laborers, and went out of his way to make a bitter attack upon those responsible for the passage of the bill. While the raise given to the politicians amounted to half a million dollars annually, the increased pay provided for the laborers, 5,000 in number, would have amounted to a total of but \$300,000 a year, and work would also have been furnished to many more men who are now compelled to depend upon charity for an existence. Nothing is too good for the grafters and heelers, while the laborers who do useful work are kept at the starvation level and are abused and insulted by the shameless politicians besides. Those Eastern "labor leaders" who advise the rank and file to keep out of labor politics and allow themselves to be sold out should now renew their howls for McClellan for President, and, as his running mate, what's the matter with Governor Douglass! The platform might be written by Tom Platt, Senator from the United States Express Co. and another great "workingman's friend," who sits in his office in New York and dictates that the teamsters' strike in Chicago shall not be settled. Really if a lot of Hottentots or ring-nosed Zulus made as poor use of

their ballots as do our own bright, intelligent, patriotic American sovereigns we would have a right to pity them. It is small wonder that the great capitalists of the country have a hard job to hide the contempt that they feel for the working class.

Now the union smashers are spreading a fairy tale about a gang of sluggers having marked David M. Parry for a beating, who side-stepped the toughs by chasing off to Europe on a vacation. Union people are watching for details of this latest dime-novel narrative. They cannot be blamed if they refuse to believe everything that comes from employers' associations and their newspapers of alleged "confessions" made by some of their hired spies who are thugs one day and heroes the next. A short time ago columns of stuff appeared in the daily organs charging union sluggers with having killed a man by the name of Carlstrom in Chicago, and subsequently it turned out that his death was due to pneumonia. A little over a year ago the Independence (Col.) depot platform was blown up and all the satellites of capitalism immediately accused the union miners with being responsible for that horrible crime in which 14 men were blown into eternity, despite the fact that circumstantial evidence accumulated which indicated that the operators and their hirelings were guilty. When it appeared that the union-wreckers would have some difficulty in explaining away some suspicious circumstances and clues, a fellow named Robert Romaine, arrested for burglary and incarcerated in the Kansas penitentiary, handily bobbed up with a "confession" that he and some union miners did the job. Investigation proved that Romaine was a liar, and recently he admitted that his story was false and that one Frank Shaefer, an agent of the Mine Owners' Association, wired him to make the "confession" for a few dollars and a promise of freedom. But the daily organs, having spread the infamous lie broadcast, will not do the miners the justice of pronouncing them guiltless. It looks as though the heartless plutocracy has added a brand new department to its union-smashing campaign—that of having "confessions" made to order and springing them at a critical period in an industrial struggle.

Both the operators and miners are preparing for a national suspension of work next spring. One of the most prominent officials of the United Mine Workers informed me a few days ago that all indications point to a severe struggle not only in the bituminous districts, but in the anthracite field also. While the question of wages will be, as it always is, the principal issue at stake, other matters, such as the open shop policy in the anthracite districts, the "shot-firing" demand in the soft coal fields, honest weights and measures, the price of supplies, rents, etc., that have caused irritation in many places will in all probability be given considerable attention. In the hard coal region the men have been very indifferent to their own interests during the past year—in fact, after they secured their three years' agreement many of them became imbued with the hallucination that the operators were their friends and their unions were no longer necessary to safeguard working conditions, and to save a few dollars in dues they dropped into arrears or out of the organization altogether. At present every effort is being made to bring the miners back into the fold, and President Mitchell has taken personal charge of the work and expects to remain in the anthracite districts all summer to build up the locals. According to the officers, the soft-coal miners have plenty of reason to complain. Work has been exceptionally unsteady in the last year, thousands of the men averaging from two to four days a week, and so their earning power is exceedingly low, aside from the fact that they were compelled to accept a reduction of wages a year ago. The belief is general that the industry is overcrowded—that too many mines are in operation and too many men are looking for work in the trade. While under a scientific method of production the industry could be regulated to provide a good living for all, under the present system it is doubtful

whether any plan can be enforced to minimize the chronic evils that confront the miners. They will have to go on suffering because too much wealth is produced or is in sight, while the operators seem to thrive whether there is a scarcity or an overproduction of coal, and they are not the least backward in boosting prices, whittling down wages and openly preparing for a struggle with the workers who have enriched them. The pessimistic view of the officer referred to is likewise shared by one of the operators' officials with whom I discussed the situation recently. But the latter gentleman makes the novel claim that "the miners now have a new organization, which greatly differs from the old, conservative union, in that it has become socialistic in character!" He added: "You may be skeptical on this point, but I tell you I know what the miners are talking about. They are repeating socialistic phrases and making all sorts of wild and woolly claims, and pretty soon they will declare that the employers have no rights that they are bound to respect." He was asked why the miners did not vote the Socialist ticket in greater numbers and replied: "Well, I expect they will be foolish enough to fall into that habit, too." It is undoubtedly time that more or less of a socialistic sentiment is spreading among the miners, which is certainly not reflected in their official newspaper, however, or in the speeches of some of their officers, and perhaps if the militant Socialists pushed their campaign of education among the rank and file more earnestly and systematically those workers would give a good account of themselves at the ballot-box this fall.

SOCIALISM ABROAD

GERMANY.

Events in Germany would seem to be reaching a sort of climax which will demand some changes in the traditional policy of German socialism. The reactionary movement, which found expression in taking the franchise away from the voters of Saxony, and in the growth of strong employers' associations, is now demanding the overthrow of universal suffrage. In Hamburg there have always been quite extensive property qualifications for voters. In this city an income of 1,200 marks (about \$300) has been necessary as a condition of suffrage. With the growth of the trade union movement the wages of a large proportion of workers had been forced up to this point and as a result there were thirteen socialists elected to the municipal council during the last two years. It thus became evident to the capitalists and nobility of Hamburg that unless some steps were taken the socialists would soon be in control of the city. They made no secret about their aims, but openly declared that they proposed to defend Hamburg from the "red flood." Consequently a law was introduced, which has already passed the upper house, and will undoubtedly become a part of the fundamental law of the city providing for election by classes. This law makes three divisions of the voting population, according as their incomes are below 3,000 marks, or above 6,000 or between these two amounts. Each of these classes will then elect an equal number of representatives. According to an estimate which has been made there will be 24,000 voters in the lowest class, 9,000 in the second and 7,000 in the third. It will be seen at once that this makes it impossible for the working class to ever obtain a majority.

The national congress of the German socialist trades unions was held in Cologne during the month of May. According to the official report of Legien the 213 delegates were present representing 1,252,000 organized working men in contrast with 156 delegates representing 681,000 at the last convention. In every way the condition of the union has improved to correspond with their number.

The principle questions of general interest which were discussed at the convention were those concerning the May Day celebration and the "mass strike," as the new utilization of the unions for political purposes is called, in contrast with the "general strike" in the anarchistic sense. On both of these questions the convention took rather an indefinite stand. The socialist press criticizes them quite strongly for their wavering position. The resolutions which were adopted were well nigh meaningless. There has been quite an extensive movement among the trade unions in favor of the general strike and also in favor of dissolving connection with the socialist party. The same persons, however, have seldom favored

both these positions. We have indeed the rather remarkable spectacle of Karl Kautsky and Bernstein standing together in advocacy of the general strike, in opposition to most of the trades union members of the socialist fraction in the Reichstag.

FRANCE.

The French socialists are very much disturbed over the question of patriotism versus internationalism. Gustaf Hervé has recently declared that he was opposed to war under any and all conditions and would not be in favor of fighting even if France was invaded, but would only take up arms in defense of the rise of the working class. Gérault-Richard was so much aroused by this statement that he refused to belong to the same party as Hervé and consequently has withdrawn, all of which partakes a little of the appearance of opera bouffe to the Anglo-Saxon mind.

BELGIUM.

The national convention of the socialist party was recently held at Brussels with 561 delegates present. The main question under discussion was that of alliance with the liberals. After considerable opposition a resolution offered by Vandervelde was adopted which permits temporary alliances to be made with those parties who will stand for universal equal suffrage.

In moving the resolution, however, Comrade Vandervelde declared that it was necessary to fight all bourgeois parties and expressed himself against such alliances.

A very encouraging report was received concerning the propaganda in the farming districts. A Flemish organization has recently been formed having the special work of carrying on the agitation in the Catholic agricultural sections. Steps were also taken to arrange for a more active work in the organization of trades unions.

NORWAY.

As has been reported in the daily press, Norway has practically dissolved the union between her and Sweden. This has caused much talk of war, but the Swedish socialists at once took occasion to meet and declare their opposition to any hostility and to express their sympathy for the Norwegian comrades. The Norwegian socialists in the meantime will endeavor to secure the formation of a republic, but they have little hopes of immediate success. In this same connection it is noteworthy that nearly all the telegraph dispatches concerning the present quarrel between France and Germany have stated that the question of war is very much complicated by the probable attitude of the socialists of the two countries. It is significant that socialism has reached the point where it is impossible for the rulers to plunge their countries into war and shed the blood of the workers without considering what those who must do the fighting think about it.

BOOK REVIEWS

THE WHITE TERROR AND THE RED, by A. Cahan. A. S. Barnes & Co. Cloth, 430 pp., \$1.50.

One does not need the publisher's note which accompanies this book to tell them that it was written by one who was a part of the things concerning which he wrote. Indeed one of the criticisms which we would make of the book is that the writer is so close to his subject that he sometimes can not see the forest for the trees and crowds his canvas with events and figures until the reader feels that he had much better have made two or three books from the material he had in hand.

The book is a story of that strange romantic Russian revolutionary movement which it betrays, ends in the rotting darkness of a Russian mili- and devotion on the part of the educated classes and the peasant, and which ended in an equally fanatical, unreasoning and almost as fruitless reign of terror. It would be presumption on our part to make any judgment as to whether the events portrayed are true to life or not, but they certainly are alive and moving. We see the gradual growth of the revolutionary enthusiasm in a young noble as he progresses through the college and comes in touch at various points with the Russian autocracy.

Then we live for a time in that strange underground Russia and see it in all its nakedness. There is heroism in plenty and along with it the petty jealousies, and personalities that prove conspirators for the cause of human freedom to be very much like other men and women.

The work is a series of brilliant flash-lights thrown upon these phases of the Russian revolutionary movement. We see here how the first blind worship of the Russian peasant deified his most disreputable actions, as, for instance, Jew-baiting. The picture which is given of one of these terrible Jewish massacres is one of the strongest portions of the book, and its horrors will cling to the reader's mind long after he has laid the book aside. The work is tragic in almost every feature and, like the phase of the movement of the early eighties, which began in a pouring out of enthusiasm into prison. His characters are real men and women and none of them are demi-gods or devils. In literary style, plot and character, it is something distinctly different from conventional literature. We have the same peculiar introspection that is to be found in Ghorki and also the same unlovely types. It does not grip one with the same power as does the books of some of the Russian writers, yet it possesses a strange fascination which will not permit the reader who has once begun it to lay it aside until the end has been reached.

L'AVENIR DU SOCIALISME, by Paul Louis. Bibliotheque-Charpentier, Paris. Paper, 316 pages. 3 fr. 50.

After a survey of the existing socialist situation in various countries the author proceeds to a study of the forces which are working within the

socialist movement. He considers revisionism, which he looks upon as injurious; discusses the relation which trades unions hold to the socialist party in foreign countries and all the different forces that are at work in forming and modifying socialist thought and tactics. In the second part of the work he considers the evolution of socialist doctrines, especially with relation to nationalism and the influence of the "intellectuals." His chapter on this subject is extremely suggestive and interesting. He recognizes the fact of the ever-increasing number of this class in the socialist movement, but warns against the tendency to turn over the direction of the party into their hands. The final division of the book is given up to the discussion of the problems of socialism, including its relation to religion, militarism, the farmer question, the general strike and respect for legality. On the whole he supports the position of the extreme left wing of socialism, denouncing in measured terms all alliances with all bourgeois parties and leans toward the further extension of the general strike.

PUBLISHERS' DEPARTMENT

THE LIBRARY OF SCIENCE FOR THE WORKERS.

No experiment in the history of our co-operative publishing house has ever met with the instant success that has welcomed our start on the publication of the *Library of Science for the Workers*. The opening volume, "*The Evolution of Man*," has been out scarcely two months, but the first edition of 2,000 copies is already sold and another edition printed. This means that in sixty days enough books have been sold to pay the cost of publication, so that the bills have been paid without drawing on our capital. If this success can be repeated with the other volumes of the series, we shall be able to bring them out in rapid succession from this time on.

The second volume, *GERMS OF MIND IN PLANTS*, translated by A. M. Simons, is now in the hands of the printers, and we expect to have copies ready for delivery in early August. It is equally fascinating in style with *THE EVOLUTION OF MAN*, it is equally easy reading, and it is even more startling in the new scientific discoveries which it unfolds. At first glance it may seem a long way from the subject of this book to the principles of socialism, but the connection is close after all. We as socialists have to show that the mind of man is molded by man's economic environment. This book makes our task easy by showing how the first beginnings of mind are the outcome of natural forces.

The third volume in this library, *THE END OF THE WORLD*, translated by Margaret Wagner, will be ready in September, and will be fully described in the August REVIEW. We wish now to call attention to the special offer of the three volumes postpaid for one dollar, provided the money is sent to this office on or before July 31. On receipt of the remittance, we will send *THE EVOLUTION OF MAN* by return mail, and the other two volumes will be mailed on publication. This special offer is made simply to provide the money to print the new books, and it will not be extended beyond July 31. The price of the volumes will thenceforth be fifty cents each, without discount to any one, except to stockholders in our co-operative publishing house. To them the price

will be 30 cents a volume postpaid, or 25 cents a volume if sent at purchaser's expense.

A share of stock costs ten dollars, and may be paid for at the rate of a dollar a month. It draws no dividends, but it carries with it the right to buy the company's books at cost. The company's price list already includes nearly all the most important works on socialism. It will now be rapidly enlarged to include the latest and best books of popular science.

THE COMPANY'S FINANCES.

In last month's REVIEW an offer was made by Charles H. Kerr to duplicate the contributions of all other stockholders for the purpose of paying off what remains of the debt and putting the company on a cash basis. This will make it possible to use all money coming from the sale of stock to bring out new books, and it will also relieve the company from the burden of interest, so that future profits from book sales can be used to publish more books. The amounts contributed during June were as follows:

H. A. Munro, Alabama	\$ 1.00
E. F. Everitt, California	2.00
William A. Whittiker, Connecticut	3.00
Mrs. Clarence Mackay, New York	50.00
"B," Massachusetts	10.00
E. H. Bramball, Maine	3.00
N. O. Nelson, Illinois	50.00
E. P. Clark, Connecticut50
J. A. Teit, British Columbia	1.10
M. V. Ball, Pennsylvania	2.00
F. M. Crunden, Missouri	10.00
Charles S. Wheeler, Illinois	5.00
Jules L. Kugler, Massachusetts40
J. I. Livingston, New York	10.00
Mrs. S. D. Whitney, California	21.00
W. H. Hueckel, Illinois	20.00
F. N. Prevey, Ohio	1.00
Rudolph Pusch, Illinois	1.00
Local Franklin, Socialist Party, Pennsylvania	1.00
Jacob Bruning, Illinois	25.00
W. R. Hale, South Carolina	5.00
T. J. Lloyd, New York	5.00
Charles H. Kerr, Illinois	227.00
Total,	\$454.00

One thing we wish to make clear in connection with this effort to free the company from debt. That is that the debt does not represent a deficit. We have not been running the book business at a loss; on the contrary there has been a profit which has just about balanced the loss

on the REVIEW. What the debt means is that we have never had more than a small fraction of the capital really needed to bring out the books required by the socialist movement, and thus we have had to use our credit.

For years we carried a floating debt to printers and banks of several thousand dollars. This is all paid off, except \$400 to one bank on which we pay 7 per cent interest. Some money has been lent by stockholders, and most of this is at four per cent interest and can be kept as long as we need it. One stockholder, however, lent us \$1,600 at 6 per cent two years ago. He needs to use the money as soon as we can raise it for him. The company has paid him \$100 quite recently, leaving \$1,500 still to be paid. We can save an interest charge of \$90 a year by getting this debt out of the way.

One comrade accompanied a contribution by a rather gloomy letter to the effect that he did not want to contribute to a house that was "always in hot water." But the company got itself out of the "hot water" some time ago. Its solvency does not depend at all upon the raising of this debt fund. We can if necessary pay off every dollar of the debt in time by using for this purpose all the money that comes in from the sale of stock, and all the profit from the sale of books, instead of using the money to publish the REVIEW and to make plates of new books.

The question is whether the stockholders prefer this plan rather than raising the debt now so that the money that comes in hereafter can be used to enlarge the company's work. Those whose names appear in the list prefer to raise the debt now. How do the others feel about it?

In the June REVIEW, the offer of Charles H. Kerr to duplicate the contributions of other stockholders was limited to the month of June. He has however concluded to extend the offer to the end of 1905, so as to get the debt out of the way once for all. It will not be a hard thing to do if all who can will help.

Our co-operative publishing house is no longer a mere experiment. The early stockholders put in their money upon what was then at least an even chance of seeing it lost without any results being accomplished. Still, they took the chance, and they have the satisfaction of being joint owners in the largest and most successful socialist book publishing house in the United States, if not in the world.

This simply means that in our co-operative organization we have hit on the right plan. We have an efficient and economical management combined with democratic control. Nine-tenths of the stock is held in single shares of ten dollars each. It only remains to pay off what is left of the debt, and we shall have a solidly established publishing house that will be in no way dependent on the life of one individual, but will continue to circulate the literature of socialism until the time comes to turn over its assets to the co-operative commonwealth.

If you are not already a stockholder, you can help by subscribing for a share. If you are a stockholder you can help by contributing your fair proportion toward paying off the debt.